arXiv:1603.05700v2 [q-fin.ST] 27 Jul 2016

Estimating the Integrated Parameter of the Locally Parametric Model in High-Frequency Data

Yoann Potiron*

This version: July 28, 2016

Abstract

In this paper, we give a general time-varying parameter model, where the multidimensional parameter follows a continuous local martingale. As such, we call it the locally parametric model (LPM). The quantity of interest is defined as the integrated value over time of the parameter process $\Theta := T^{-1}\int_0^T \theta_t^* dt$. We provide a local parametric estimator (LPE) of Θ based on the original (non time-varying) parametric model estimator and conditions under which we can show the central limit theorem. As an example of how to apply the limit theory provided in this paper, we build a time-varying friction parameter extension of the (semiparametric) model with uncertainty zones (Robert and Rosenbaum (2012)) and we show that we can verify the conditions for the estimation of integrated volatility. Moreover, practical applications in time series, such as the optimal block length and local bias-correction, are discussed and numerical simulations are carried on the local MLE of a time-varying parameter MA(1) model to illustrate them.

Keywords: continuous local martingale, high-frequency data; integrated parameter ; local parametric estimator ; time series ; time-varying parameter model

*Faculty of Business and Commerce, Keio University. 2-15-45 Mita, Minato-ku, Tokyo, 108-8345, Japan. Phone: +81-3-5418-6571. Email: potiron@fbc.keio.ac.jp website: http://www.fbc.keio.ac.jp/~potiron

1 Introduction

Modeling dynamics is very important in various fields, including finance, economics, physics, environmental engineering, geology and sociology. Time-varying parametric models can deal with a special problem in dynamics, namely, the temporal evolution of systems. The extensive literature on time-varying parameter models and local parametric methods include and are not limited to Fan and Gijbels (1996), Hastie and Tibshirani (1993) or Fan and Zhang (1999) when regression and generalized regression models are involved, locally stationary processes following the work of Dahlhaus (1997, 2000), Dahlhaus and Rao (2006), or any other time-varying parameter models, e.g. Stock and Watson (1998) and Kim and Nelson (2006).

In this paper, we propose to specify local parametric methods in the particular context of high-frequency observations for a general class of problems. In the simplest model, we assume that we observe regularly between 0 and the fixed horizon time T a time series $(R_{1,n}, \cdots, R_{n,n})$ with corresponding (discrete) time-varying parameter $(\nu^*_{1,n}, \cdots, \nu^*_{n,n})$ which can be expressed as the interpolation of an underlying continuous local martingale time-varying parameter θ^*_t. By interpolation, we mean that the discrete time series parameter $\nu^*_{i,n} = \theta^*_{\frac{i-1}{n}T}$. The target quantity in this monograph is defined as the integrated parameter

$$\Theta := \frac{1}{T}\int_0^T \theta^*_s ds. \tag{1}$$

We also assume that the econometrician has a parametric estimator for the time series at hand, such as the MLE. This paper aims to build general estimators $\widehat{\Theta}_n$ of (1), based on the parametric estimator. It also investigates conditions under which we can establish the corresponding central limit theorem (CLT).

When parameters are time-varying, researchers frequently chop the available data into short time blocks of size h_n and assume homoskedasticity within the blocks (e.g. Foster and Nelson (1996)). In this work, we propose to use the same strategy to estimate the integrated parameter (1): we estimate the *local parameter* on each block by using the parametric estimator on the observations within the block and take a weighted sum of the local parameter estimates, where each weight is equal to the corresponding block

length. We call the obtained estimator the *local parametric estimator* (LPE). Taking the sum of local estimates is rather a very common choice in the high-frequency data literature, see for example the work of Jacod and Rosenbaum (2013). Depending on the case, the LPE can actually differ very much from the original parametric estimator.

We prove that under the diffusion assumption of θ_t^*, we can trust the parametric model locally. In high-frequency data, the idea that a continuous local martingale parameter implies that the model is locally valid builds on previous investigations by e.g. Reiß (2011) or Mykland and Zhang (2009, 2011) of the maximum size of a neighborhood in which we can hold volatility of an asset constant.

We discuss here the practical reasons why techniques of this paper are possibly appealing to the time series econometrician. Imagine that θ_t^* is a noisy version of the "economic" parameter of interest ν, in the sense that θ_t^* oscillates randomly around ν and that $\nu \approx \Theta$. On the one hand, if the econometrician assumes that his model is not noisy and applies "blindly" the global MLE, he will most likely obtain a biased estimate of ν[1]. On the other hand, since $\nu \approx \Theta$, using $\widehat{\Theta}_n$ will most likely provide better estimates of ν. The contribution of this paper is in that it quantifies the error (with the CLT), provides the optimal block size h_n to use, namely $n^{\frac{1}{2}}$, and advocates to use a bias-corrected MLE estimator on blocks (otherwise the asymptotic bias will explode). All of those practical applications in time series, along with numerical simulations on the MA(1) example, can be consulted in Section 5.

As mentioned previously, this paper can actually deal with a broader class of prob-

[1]We remind the reader that assuming that ν is constant when it's not can raise serious estimation issues. It means that we are using the estimator with the wrong model. In likelihood theory, ever since Fisher (1922, 1925) introduced the method of maximum likelihood, a significant body of the literature has taken an interest in the asymptotic behavior of the MLE when the model is misspecified. This was pioneered by Berk (1966, 1970) for the Bayesian approach and Huber (1967), who took the classical perspective.

More recently, White (1982), among numerous other authors, also investigated the issue and showed that the *Quasi Maximum Likelihood Estimator* (QMLE) is no longer necessarily consistent with the object of interest, in our case the integrated parameter (1). The author showed that the QMLE can converge to a value, but this is not necessarily the one the econometrician has in mind. Also, the estimated standard deviation can be wrong

lems in high-frequency data. In particular, the parameter process can be different from a time-varying time series parameter and, for example, equal to the volatility, the covariation between several assets, the time-varying variance of the microstructure noise, the friction parameter of the model with uncertainty zones (see Section 7 for more details), the betas, the volatility of volatility, the leverage effect process, the event arrival rate or any other parameter driving the observation times (see for example Section 10.1), the parameters of a self-exciting process (see Clinet and Potiron (2016)) or in general of any time-varying parameter extension of a parametric model, etc. As an example of an application of (1), Chen and Mykland (2015) measured the liquidity risk when the parameter is equal to the time-varying variance of the microstructure noise.

Also, the model can be more general than a time series. Indeed, we assume that the econometrician has a time-varying parameter model (and in particular a parametric model) at hand, which is contained within the *Locally Parametric Model* (LPM) class defined in Section 2. The LPM covers a large class of time-varying parameter models, as we will illustrate in the examples of Section 5, Section 6, Section 7, Section 9 and Section 10. In particular, in the case where we model the price of an asset as a continuous *efficient* stochastic process, it allows for endogeneity (the sampling times can be correlated with the efficient price and the microstructure noise), auto-correlated time-varying noise, correlation between the efficient return and the noise, as well as multidimensional asynchronous observations.

In high-frequency data, when estimating a quantity such as volatility, one has to first build a model for the observations. When observations are close, empirical studies strongly suggest that *the market microstructure* generates a divergence between the observed price process and the efficient price process. This divergence could be induced, among other things, by transaction price changes occurring on the tick grid (price discreteness) or by the existence of a waiting-list for sellers and buyers at each level of price (bid-ask spreads). Accordingly, the market microstructure is very often assumed to be stationary (i.e. with non time-varying variance), independent of the true price process and not autocorrelated. Nonetheless, Hansen and Lunde (2006) have documented empirically that the microstructure noise is time-dependent and correlated with the efficient price itself. Correlation between the efficient price and the noise can be explained

by rounding effects, price stickiness, asymmetric information, etc. Kalnina and Linton (2008) introduced in their model possible non-stationarity of noise and correlation.

Furthermore, it is well observed empirically that the order of arrival times of transaction prices are correlated with the price level, volatility, and microstructure noise. However, it is very common to assume full independence among them. On the contrary, endogeneity means that the sampling times are not independent of the other quantities. Endogeneity can have bad effects on the behavior of an estimator. When estimating volatility, Li et al. (2014) and Fukasawa (2010) showed that Realized Volatility estimator (RV) has an asymptotic bias when sampling times are endogenous. They estimated the bias, and removed the estimate from the Realized Volatility estimator to obtain a bias-corrected estimator.

We discuss now the main theoretical contribution of this paper, which is the CLT for $\widehat{\Theta}_n$. Depending on the model and the estimator chosen by the econometrician, the obtained conditions for the CLT (see Section 4) can be either straightforward or cumbersome to verify. Nonetheless, our hope is that for any LPM and an accompanying large set of estimators, this paper will help the econometrician by breaking the original nonparametric problem into two easier sub-problems, a parametric problem and a control of the error between the nonparametric and the parametric problem. Two examples of application of those techniques are available in the literature. Potiron and Mykland (2015) introduced a bias-corrected Hayashi-Yoshida estimator (Hayashi and Yoshida (2005)) of the high-frequency covariance and showed the corresponding CLT. To model duration data, Clinet and Potiron (2016) built a time-varying parameter extension to the Hawkes self-exciting process, derived the bias-corrected MLE and showed the CLT of the corresponding LPE. In Section 7, we consider another problem in which we verify the conditions provided in this paper (see Section 4) and thus establish the CLT. This problem is about estimating volatility with a time-varying friction parameter extension, which we build, of the model with uncertainty zones introduced in Robert and Rosenbaum (2011).

The remaining of this paper is organized as follows. The LPM is introduced in the following section. Estimation is discussed in Section 3. Conditions for the CLT are stated in Section 4. We discuss in Section 5 the practical applications on time

series and carry numerical simulations on the MA(1) model. In Section 6, we provide a possible application of local MA(1) to estimate volatility. We give the main theoretical application, establish a CLT and look at an empirical sketch for a time-varying friction parameter extension of the model with uncertainty zones in Section 7. We conclude in Section 8. Theoretical topics, including in particular a list of models which are contained within the LPM class and proofs, are discussed in the Appendix.

2 The Locally Parametric Model (LPM)

2.1 Data-generating mechanism

We assume that we infer from the d_r-dimensional vectors $\{R_{1,n}, \cdots, R_{N_n,n}\}$, which are functions of the observations where N_n can be random, the observation times are such that $\tau_{0,n} := 0 < \tau_{1,n} < \cdots < \tau_{N_n,n} \leq T$ and $\left[\tau_{i-1,n}, \tau_{i,n}\right]$ is the time block corresponding to $R_{i,n}$. We further assume that the last component of $R_{i,n}$, $R_{i,n}^{(d_r)}$, is equal to the time increment $\Delta\tau_{i,n}$. As an example when $d_r := 2$, $R_{i,n}^{(1)}$ can be defined as the (possibly log) *returns* of the original observations. As such, we will refer abusively to $R_{i,n}$ as *returns* in the rest of the paper, but they should be thought as observable quantities. We assume that the returns $R_{i,n}$ depend on the underlying parameter process θ_t^*. In particular, the sampling times can depend on θ_t^*.

2.2 The parameter

We will assume that the p-dimensional parameter process $\theta_t^* := \left((\theta_t^*)^{(1)}, \cdots, (\theta_t^*)^{(p)}\right)$, which is restricted to lie in K, a (not necessarily compact) subset of $\mathbb{R}^p$, is a continuous local martingale of the form

$$d\theta_t^* := \sigma_t^\theta dW_t^\theta \tag{2}$$

where σ_t^θ is a random nonnegative process (of dimension $p \times p$), and W_t^θ a standard p-dimensional Brownian motion. The parameter θ_t^* can be for example equal to the volatility, the high-frequency covariance, the betas, etc.

We don't assume any independence between θ_t^* and the other quantities driving the observations, such as the Brownian motion of the efficient price process, the volatility

of the efficient price process, the microstructure noise, etc. In particular, there can be leverage effect (see e.g. Wang and Mykland (2014), Aït-Sahalia et al. (2014)). Also, the arrival times $\tau_{i,n}$ and the parameter θ_t^* can be correlated, i.e. there is endogeneity in sampling times.

In the rest of this paper, for any u-dimensional vector $\nu := (\nu^{(1)}, \cdots, \nu^{(u)})$, we will use the notation $\mid \nu \mid := \sum_{k=1}^{u} |\nu^{(k)}|$ when referring to the Manhattan norm. Also, for any $\theta \in K$, we define the 1-dimensional vector θ^+ as the minimum value of the 1-dimensional sub-parameters restricted to be positive. We assume that $\mid \theta_t^* \mid$ is locally bounded and $(\theta_t^*)^+$ is locally bounded away from 0. Furthermore, we assume that the volatility of the parameter, σ_t^θ, is locally bounded.

2.3 Asymptotics

There are commonly two choices of asymptotics in the literature: the *high-frequency* asymptotics, which makes the number of observations explode on $[0, T]$, and the *low-frequency* asymptotics, which takes T to infinity. We chose the former one. Investigating the low-frequency implementation case is beyond the scope of this paper[2].

2.4 The model for the returns

We advise the reader that this section refer to very specific models in the high-frequency financial literature and thus that it might be hard to see why we use such a structure for the returns at first reading. The reader interested in time series can go directly to Section 2.5, and the reader curious to see where the general comes from should consult Section 9 prior to reading this one (several references are made accordingly in the following). We want to allow a general model for the returns $R_{i,n}$. To do that, we introduce the random non-observed quantities $Q_{i,n}$, which take values into the general space $\mathcal{Q}_n$. We also define $M_{i,n} := (Q_{i,n}, R_{i,n})$, and assume that $M_{i,n}$ take values on the space $\mathcal{M}_n$[3], which is a subset of $\mathcal{Q}_n \times \mathbb{R}^{d_r}$. Let m be a nonnegative integer (which can be infinite) which will stand for the order of memory in the model. We define

[2]If we set down the asymptotic theory in the same way as in p.3 of Dahlhaus (1997), we conjecture that the results of this paper would stay true.

[3]$\mathcal{M}_n$ is assumed to be a Borel space.

the m initial values $M_{-(m-1),n}, \cdots, M_{0,n}$ of the Markov chain. Also, we introduce the m-dimensional "memory" vectors of past quantities $\mathbf{M}_{i,n} := (M_{i,n}, \cdots, M_{i-(m-1),n})$, which take values on a space $\mathcal{M}_{m,n}$ (subset of $\mathcal{M}_n^m$). Finally, we will refer to $\mathbf{M}_{i,n} := (\mathbf{Q}_{i,n}, \mathbf{R}_{i,n})$ respectively for the unobserved part and the observed part of $\mathbf{M}_{i,n}$. The parametric model is assumed to be expressed as

$$M_{i,n} := F_n(\mathbf{M}_{i-1,n}, U_{i,n}, \theta^*), \tag{3}$$

where $F_n(x, y, z)$ is a $\mathcal{M}_n$-valued non-random function[4], the random innovation $U_{i,n}$ are IID with distribution U for a fixed n (but the distribution can depend on n) and independent of the past information. The parametric model (3) can be compared to the simple parametric model (44). The only change is that we allow for past-correlation in the model.

The interpretation of $Q_{i,n}$ is as follows. Among all the non-observed information we have from the past, $Q_{i,n}$ are the quantities which matter in the distribution of the future returns. In particular, the parametric model (3) allows for auto-correlation in returns (up to a lag possibly bigger than m). The reader should look at Section 10 to see how we identify $Q_{i,n}$ and $R_{i,n}$ to the quantities in different models.

In analogy with (45), we assume that the time-varying parameter model can be expressed as[5]

$$M_{i,n} = F_n(\mathbf{M}_{i-1,n}, U_{i,n}, \{\theta_s^*\}_{\tau_{i-1,n} \leq s \leq \tau_{i,n}}). \tag{4}$$

If we take $\mathcal{Q}_n$ big enough and $m = +\infty$, it is almost always possible to find a function F_n and unobserved quantities $Q_{i,n}$ such that (4) holds. It means that most of the existing models in the literature which assume null-drift Itô-process time-varying parameter are contained within the LPM class. Nonetheless, conditions in Section 4 will be harder to

[4]We assume that for i any positive integer, $U_{i,n} \in \mathcal{U}_n$ where $\mathcal{U}_n$ is a Borel space and that $F_n(x, y, z)$ is defined on $\mathcal{M}_{m,n} \times \mathcal{U}_n \times \mathcal{C}_p(\mathbb{R}^+)$. Additionally, we assume that $F_n(x, y, z)$ is a jointly measurable $\mathcal{M}_n$-valued function such that for any $(\mathbf{M}_n, U_n, \theta_t) \in \mathcal{M}_{m,n} \times \mathcal{U}_n \times \mathcal{C}_p(\mathbb{R}^+)$, we have $\mathbb{E} \mid F_n(\mathbf{M}_n, U_n, \theta_t) \mid < \infty$

[5]In all generality, we can assume $M_{i,n} = F_n(\mathbf{M}_{i-1,n}, U_{i,n}, \{\theta_s^*\}_{0 \leq s \leq \tau_{i,n}})$, and the central limit theorem stays true under this more general assumption. In that case, the conditions of Section 4 would be slightly altered. Nonetheless, we choose to work under (4) to keep the analysis more tractable in Section 4.

verify with a bigger $\mathcal{Q}_n$ space, and techniques of this paper might be unhelpful in that case. The econometrician should investigate the simplest possible $\mathcal{Q}_n$ and the smallest m to build her time-varying parameter model.

Equivalently, the parametric model (3) can be seen as a (m-dependent) Markov chain of order m with a general state space $\mathcal{M}_{m,n}$. We insist on the fact that under the time-varying parameter model (4), the returns $R_{i,n}$ can be much different from a Markov chain. Under the time-varying parameter model, $M_{i,n}$ is not even necessarily a inhomogeneous Markov chain (of order m). Nonetheless, we can see in (4) that $M_{i,n}$ is almost a inhomogeneous Markov chain (of order m), except for the evolution of the parameter θ_t^* part which is not necessarily Markovian. In particular, if we assume that the volatility σ_t^θ of the parameter θ_t^* is not time-varying, $M_{i,n}$ is a inhomogeneous Markov chain (of order m). In the following, we will use the expression "Markov chain" but the reader should understand "Markov chain under the parametric model" or even "locally Markov chain". We also drop the part "of order m". Note that the simple model introduced in Section 9.1 is a particular case with $m = 0$ and no unobserved quantities $Q_{i,n}$.

2.5 Time series specification and MA(1) example

We specify the above definitions for a one-dimensional time series. In that case, we assume that the observation times are regular of the form $\tau_{i,n} = \frac{i}{n}T$, and thus that the number of observations is $N_n = n$. We assume that the time-varying time series can be expressed as the interpolation of θ_t^* via

$$M_{i,n} = F_n(\mathbf{M}_{i-1,n}, U_{i,n}, \theta^*_{\tau_{i-1,n}}), \tag{5}$$

where θ_t^* is assumed to be independent of all the innovations. Numerous time series[6] are of the parametric form (3) and admits a time-varying parameter extension following (5). We provide details for the MA(1). In this specific example, several time-varying extensions are possible and we choose to work with the time-varying parameter model

[6] We can actually show that any time series in state space form can be expressed with a corresponding F_n function.

$R_{i,n} = \mu_{\tau_{i-1,n}} + \sqrt{\kappa_{\tau_{i-1,n}}}\lambda_{i,n} + \beta_{\tau_{i-1,n}}\sqrt{\kappa_{\tau_{i-1,n}}}\lambda_{i-1,n}$, where $\lambda_{i,n}$ are standard normally-distributed white noise error terms, and κ_t is the time-varying variance. The three-dimensional parameter is defined as $\theta_t^* := (\mu_t, \beta_t, \kappa_t) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}_*^+$. To express the MA(1) as the parametric model (3) and a time-varying parameter model (4), we fix both the unobserved quantity and innovation equal to the white noise $Q_{i,n} = \lambda_{i,n}$ and $U_{i,n} = \lambda_{i,n}$, and the order of the model $m = 1$. We can define now the function

$$F_n\big(m := (q, r), u, (\mu, \beta, \kappa)\big) = \mu + \sqrt{\kappa}u + \beta\sqrt{\kappa}q.$$

We have thus expressed the MA(1) as a LPM.

Aït-Sahalia et al. (2005) and Xiu (2010) have studied the MA(1) model in high-frequency data to estimate volatility in the following example. If we assume that we have regular observation times and that the microstructure noise is uncorrelated with the efficient price and IID normally distributed, the parametric model of the observed returns is a MA(1). The details on that example are to be found in Section 6.

3 Estimation

We need first to fix the vocabulary for the rest of this paper. *Parametric model* will refer to the (non time-varying) parametric model of the econometrician, and not to the time-varying parameter model. Correspondingly, *parametric estimator* stands for the parametric estimator (in the parametric model).

Since the stochastic parameter θ_t^* is continuous, the parametric model is not too far from the time-varying parameter model locally. We define the block size h_n. First, we consider the estimation of the integrated parameter on the first block and the corresponding observations are the first h_n observations, i.e. $R_{1,n}, \cdots, R_{h_n,n}$. If we let $\tilde{\Theta}_{1,n} := \theta_0^*$ be the initial parameter value and we define on the first block for $j = 1, \cdots, h_n$ the return approximations $\tilde{R}_{j,n}$ which follow the parametric model with mixture of parameters $\tilde{\Theta}_{1,n}$, then $\tilde{R}_{1,n}^j$ and $R_{j,n}$ are very close to each other since the observation times $\tau_{1,n}, \cdots, \tau_{h_n,n}$ are in a small neighborhood of 0. Thus, because true and approximated returns are approximately the same, one can apply the parametric

estimator to the observed returns $R_{j,n}$, even though $R_{j,n}$ are not following the parametric model. We thus obtain an estimate $\widehat{\Theta}_{1,n}$ of the initial parameter value $\tilde{\Theta}_{1,n}$. We also define the spot parameter's average on the first block as

$$\Theta_{1,n} := \frac{\int_{\mathrm{T}_{0,n}}^{\mathrm{T}_{1,n}} \theta_s^* ds}{\Delta \mathrm{T}_{1,n}}, \tag{6}$$

where the first block inital time $\mathrm{T}_{0,n} := 0$ and final time $\mathrm{T}_{1,n} := \tau_{h_n,n}$. Since the first block length $\Delta \mathrm{T}_{1,n}$ is very small, the value of $\tilde{\Theta}_{1,n}$ is approximately equal to the average of the spot parameter on the first block $\Theta_{1,n}$. Thus, $\widehat{\Theta}_{1,n}$ can be used to estimate $\Theta_{1,n}$.

More generally, for $i = 2, \cdots, B_n$ we define the spot parameter's average on the ith block as

$$\Theta_{i,n} := \frac{\int_{\mathrm{T}_{i-1,n}}^{\mathrm{T}_{i,n}} \theta_s^* ds}{\Delta \mathrm{T}_{i,n}}, \tag{7}$$

where $\mathrm{T}_{i,n} := \min(\tau_{ih_n}, T)$. Let $B_n := \ulcorner N_n h_n^{-1} \urcorner$ be the number of blocks. For $i = 2, \cdots, B_n$ we estimate in the same way $\Theta_{i,n}$ with initial value $\tilde{\Theta}_{i,n} := \theta^*_{\mathrm{T}_{i-1,n}}$ using the parametric estimator on the ith block $\widehat{\Theta}_{i,n}$. Then, we take the weighted sum of $\widehat{\Theta}_{i,n}$ and obtain an estimator of the integrated spot process

$$\widehat{\Theta}_n := \frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^{B_n} \widehat{\Theta}_{i,n} \Delta \mathrm{T}_{i,n}. \tag{8}$$

Note that each block includes exactly h_n observations, except for the last one, which might include fewer observations. We call (8) the *local parametric estimator* (LPE), since we are are estimating with the parametric estimator on each block.

In the time series case, note that for $i = 1, \cdots, B_{n-1}$, we have that $\Delta \mathrm{T}_{i,n} = \frac{h_n}{n} T$. In particular, if nh_n^{-1} is an integer, $\widehat{\Theta}_n$ can be expressed as

$$\widehat{\Theta}_n := \frac{1}{B_n} \sum_{i=1}^{B_n} \widehat{\Theta}_{i,n}. \tag{9}$$

4 The central limit theorem

We investigate in the following of this section the limit distribution. Formally, for a $l > 0$ (with corresponding rate of convergence $n^{\frac{1}{l}}$), we aim to find the limit distribution of

$$n^{\frac{1}{l}} T^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{B_n} \big(\widehat{\Theta}_{i,n} - \Theta_{i,n}\big) \Delta \mathrm{T}_{i,n}. \tag{10}$$

Specifically, we want to show that (10) converges *stably*[7] to a limit distribution. We give the definition of stable convergence.

Definition. (stable convergence) A sequence of integrable variable Z_n known with information $\mathcal{J}$ is said to converge weakly to an integrable random variable Z if for all $E \in \mathcal{J}$,

$$\mathbb{E}\big[Z_n \mathbf{1}_E\big] \to \mathbb{E}\big[Z \mathbf{1}_E\big]$$

This mode of convergence, which is a bit stronger than the regular convergence in distribution, is due for the statistical purpose. Because we will obtain in the variance limit of (10) random quantities, we need the stable convergence to infer the same way we would do it if the variance limit was nonrandom. Since the stable convergence needs a corresponding information $\mathcal{J}$ to be defined with, we need to be more specific about the definition of $\mathcal{J}$. We will be needing the following technical assumption, which turns out to be easily verified on examples in Section 10. The idea goes back to Heath (1977). We define ${\mathcal{I}_{i,n}}$[8] the information up to time $\tau_{i,n}$.

Condition (E0). $\mathcal{I}_{i,n}$ can be extended into ${\mathcal{J}_{i,n}}$[9], where $\mathcal{J}_{i,n}$ is the interpolated information of a continuous information $\mathcal{J}_t^{(c)}$, i.e. $\mathcal{J}_{i,n} = \mathcal{J}_{\tau_{i,n}}^{(c)}$.

[7] One can look at definitions of stable convergence in Rényi (1963), Aldous and Eagleson (1978), Chapter 3 (p. 56) of Hall and Heyde (1980), Rootzén (1980), and Section 2 (pp. 169-170) of Jacod and Protter (1998).

[8] We assume that $\mathcal{I}_{i,n}$ is a (discrete-time) filtration on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$ such that $\{\theta_s^*\}_{0 \le s \le \tau_{i,n}}$ and $U_{i,n}$ are adapted to $\mathcal{I}_{i,n}$. Also, we assume that $\mathbf{M}_{0,n}$ is $\mathcal{I}_{0,n}$-measurable. Finally, the assumption "$U_{i,n}$ independent of the past information" can be formally expressed as $U_{i,n}$ independent of $\mathcal{I}_{i-1,n}$.

[9] It means that $J_{i,n}$ is a discrete filtration and for any i nonnegative integer $\mathcal{I}_{i,n} \subset \mathcal{J}_{i,n}$

In the following of this paper, when using the conditional expectation $\mathbb{E}_\tau\big[Z\big]$[10], we will refer to the conditional expectation of Z knowing $\mathcal{J}_\tau^{(c)}$. Finally, we consider $\mathcal{J} := \mathcal{J}_T^{(c)}$ the information to go with stable convergence.

We are now more specific about the form of the parametric estimator. As in Section 9.2, the parametric estimator will include the returns $\{r_{1,n}, \cdots, r_{k,n}\}$ as inputs. Moreover, because the returns are past-correlated, we allow the parametric estimator to possibly depend on the m-dimensional vector of initial returns $\mathbf{r}_{0,n}$. To sum up, the parametric estimator takes the following form

$$\hat{\theta}_{k,n} := \hat{\theta}_{k,n}(r_{1,n}; \cdots; r_{k,n}; \mathbf{r}_{0,n}). \tag{11}$$

Let $i = 1, \cdots, B_n$ be the block number. In analogy with the "block notations" in Section 9.1, we define the Markov chain elements on the ith block $M_{i,n}^j := M_{(i-1)h_n+j,n}$ for $j = 1, \cdots, h_n$. We also define the initial vector of the ith block as $\mathbf{M}_{i,n}^0 := (M_{i,n}^0, \cdots, M_{i,n}^{-(m-1)}) := \mathbf{M}_{(i-1)h_n,n}$. Formally, the spot parameter estimator on the ith block $\widehat{\Theta}_{i,n}$ is defined as the parametric estimator with observed returns as input

$$\widehat{\Theta}_{i,n} := \hat{\theta}_{h_n,n}(R_{i,n}^1; \cdots; R_{i,n}^{h_n}; \mathbf{R}_{i,n}^0). \tag{12}$$

We alo introduce the following definition.

Definition. $\big(\mathcal{E}_{M,n}^{(1),i}\big)$ For any block number $i = 1, \cdots, B_n$ and any $M > 0$, $\mathcal{E}_{M,n}^{(1),i}$ is defined as the bounded space of time-varying parameter θ_t such that $(\theta_t, U_{i,n}^1, \cdots, U_{i,n}^{h_n}) \in \mathcal{E}_{M,n}$.

Consider the block number $i = 1, \cdots, B_n$. Let $M > 0$, $\mathbf{M} \in \mathcal{M}_{m,n}$, $\theta \in K_M$ and $\theta_t \in \mathcal{E}_{M,n}^{(1),i}$. For any $j = -(m-1), \cdots, h_n$ we define $M_{i,n}^{j,\mathbf{M},\theta}$ and $M_{i,n}^{j,\mathbf{M},\theta_t}$ the Markov chain approximations with initial vector $\mathbf{M}$ and fixed parameter θ (respectively with time-varying parameter process θ_t). The initial vectors are defined as $(M_{i,n}^{-(m-1),\mathbf{M},\theta}, \cdots, M_{i,n}^{0,\mathbf{M},\theta}) := \mathbf{M}$ and $(M_{i,n}^{-(m-1),\mathbf{M},\theta_t}, \cdots, M_{i,n}^{0,\mathbf{M},\theta_t}) := \mathbf{M}$. Also, we define the m-dimensional "memory" vectors as $\mathbf{M}_{i,n}^{j,\mathbf{M},\theta} := (M_{i,n}^{j,\mathbf{M},\theta}, \cdots, M_{i,n}^{j-(m-1),\mathbf{M},\theta})$ and $\mathbf{M}_{i,n}^{j,\mathbf{M},\theta_t} := (M_{i,n}^{j,\mathbf{M},\theta_t}, \cdots, M_{i,n}^{j-(m-1),\mathbf{M},\theta_t})$. Finally, for any positive integer j, the

[10]The underlying assumption is that τ is a $\mathcal{J}_t^{(c)}$-stopping time.

jth element of the ith block Markov chain approximations are obtained by the same recurrence relations as (3) and (4)

$$M_{i,n}^{j,\mathbf{M},\theta} := F_n\big(\mathbf{M}_{i,n}^{j-1,\mathbf{M},\theta}, U_{j,n}^i, \theta\big), \tag{13}$$

$$M_{i,n}^{j,\mathbf{M},\theta_t} := F_n\big(\mathbf{M}_{i,n}^{j-1,\mathbf{M},\theta_t}, U_{i,n}^j, \{\theta_s\}_{\tau_{i,n}^{j-1}\le s\le \tau_{i,n}^j}\big). \tag{14}$$

We introduce now the infeasible estimator on the ith block $\hat{\tilde{\Theta}}_{i,n}^{\mathbf{M}}$ with initial vector $\mathbf{M}\in\mathcal{M}_{m,n}$. Compared to (57), $\hat{\tilde{\Theta}}_{i,n}^{\mathbf{M}}$ depends also on the initial block vector. Such dependence will be useful in the decomposition (16). The infeasible estimator is defined as

$$\hat{\tilde{\Theta}}_{i,n}^{\mathbf{M}} := \hat{\theta}_{h_n,n}(R_{i,n}^{1,\mathbf{M},\tilde{\Theta}_{i,n}};\cdots;R_{i,n}^{h_n,\mathbf{M},\tilde{\Theta}_{i,n}};\mathbf{R}_{i,n}^{0,\mathbf{M},\tilde{\Theta}_{i,n}}). \tag{15}$$

Since there is endogeneity, observation times matter in this work. When approximating the returns on a block holding the parameter θ_t^* constant, we also induce a change in the observation times. For that reason, we introduce the following definitions. We define the length of the ith block with starting vector $\mathbf{M}$ and with non time-varying parameter θ as $\Delta\mathrm{T}_{i,n}^{\mathbf{M},\theta} := \sum_{j=1}^{h_n}(R_{i,n}^{j,\mathbf{M},\theta})^{(d_r)}$ and the length of the ith block with starting vector $\mathbf{M}$ and with time-varying parameter θ_t as $\Delta\mathrm{T}_{i,n}^{\mathbf{M},\theta_t} := \sum_{j=1}^{h_n}(R_{i,n}^{j,\mathbf{M},\theta_t})^{(d_r)}$.

Let the nonrandom known vector $\mathbf{M}_n^* := (\mathbf{Q}_n^*, \mathbf{R}_n^*) \in \mathcal{M}_{m,n}$, which is chosen by the econometrician to carry the analysis of (10). We can decompose $\big(\widehat{\Theta}_{i,n} - \Theta_{i,n}\big)\Delta\mathrm{T}_{i,n}$ as

$$\begin{aligned}
&\big(\widehat{\Theta}_{i,n}\Delta\mathrm{T}_{i,n} - \hat{\tilde{\Theta}}_{i,n}^{\mathbf{M}_{i,n}^0}\Delta\mathrm{T}_{i,n}^{\mathbf{M}_{i,n}^0,\tilde{\Theta}_{i,n}}\big) + \big(\hat{\tilde{\Theta}}_{i,n}^{\mathbf{M}_{i,n}^0}\Delta\mathrm{T}_{i,n}^{\mathbf{M}_{i,n}^0,\tilde{\Theta}_{i,n}} - \hat{\tilde{\Theta}}_{i,n}^{\mathbf{M}_n^*}\Delta\mathrm{T}_{i,n}^{\mathbf{M}_n^*,\tilde{\Theta}_{i,n}}\big)\\
&+\big(\hat{\tilde{\Theta}}_{i,n}^{\mathbf{M}_n^*} - \tilde{\Theta}_{i,n}\big)\Delta\mathrm{T}_{i,n}^{\mathbf{M}_n^*,\tilde{\Theta}_{i,n}} + \tilde{\Theta}_{i,n}\big(\Delta\mathrm{T}_{i,n}^{\mathbf{M}_n^*,\tilde{\Theta}_{i,n}} - \Delta\mathrm{T}_{i,n}\big) + \big(\tilde{\Theta}_{i,n} - \Theta_{i,n}\big)\Delta\mathrm{T}_{i,n}
\end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

where the first term is the error in estimation due to the use of the approximated model (15) instead of the time-varying parameter model (4), the second term is the error made when taking $\mathbf{M}_n^*$ instead of $\mathbf{M}_{i,n}^0$ as initial value of the block in the mixture of the parametric model (15), the third term corresponds to the error of the estimation of the constant parameter by the underlying approximations starting with a fixed initial value $\mathbf{M}_n^*$, the fourth term corresponds to the error of arrival times approximation when considering a parametric model starting with initial value $\mathbf{M}_n^*$ and the last term is the error made by holding the process parameter constant on each block. Note that $\hat{\tilde{\Theta}}_{i,n}^{\mathbf{M}_{i,n}^0}$

is a mixture of the parametric model with parameter $\tilde{\Theta}_{i,n}$ and a mixture of starting value $\mathbf{M}^0_{i,n}$.

It is instructive to consider (16) when we assume that the time-varying parameter model is equal to the parametric model and that the observation times are regular. In that case, all the previously defined block length approximations are equal to $\Delta \mathrm{T}_{i,n}$. The first term, the fourth term and the fifth term are equal to 0 by definition. Additionally, we can hope that asymptotically the initial values of the blocks will be forgotten and thus that under right conditions

$$n^{\frac{1}{l}} \sum_{i=1}^{B_n} \big(\hat{\tilde{\Theta}}^{\mathbf{M}^0_{i,n}}_{i,n} - \hat{\tilde{\Theta}}^{\mathbf{M}^*_n}_{i,n}\big)\Delta \mathrm{T}_{i,n} \approx 0.$$

Finally, if we assume that we know the convergence rate $n^{\frac{1}{2}}$ and the limit distribution $\mathcal{N}(0, V_{\theta^*})$ of the parametric estimator, for any $i = 1, \cdots, B_n$ we have that $h_n^{\frac{1}{2}}\big(\hat{\Theta}_{i,n} - \theta^*\big)\Delta \mathrm{T}_{i,n} \approx \mathcal{N}(0, V_{\theta^*})\Delta \mathrm{T}_{i,n}$ and thus we can hope that

$$n^{\frac{1}{2}} T^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{B_n} \big(\widehat{\Theta}_{i,n} - \theta^*\big)\Delta \mathrm{T}_{i,n} \approx \mathcal{N}(0, V_{\theta^*})$$

under right assumptions (in particular on the block size h_n).

The time-varying parameter model and endogenous arrival time case will be treated in a similar way than the parametric model case. Formally, we will be providing in the following conditions such that

$$n^{\frac{1}{l}} \sum_{i=1}^{B_n} \big(\tilde{\Theta}_{i,n} - \Theta_{i,n}\big)\Delta \mathrm{T}_{i,n} \quad \overset{\mathbb{P}}{\to} \quad 0, \tag{17}$$

$$n^{\frac{1}{l}} \sum_{i=1}^{B_n} \tilde{\Theta}_{i,n}\big(\Delta \mathrm{T}^{\mathbf{M}^*_n, \tilde{\Theta}_{i,n}}_{i,n} - \Delta \mathrm{T}_{i,n}\big) \quad \overset{\mathbb{P}}{\to} \quad 0, \tag{18}$$

$$n^{\frac{1}{l}} \sum_{i=1}^{B_n} \big(\hat{\tilde{\Theta}}^{\mathbf{M}^*_n}_{i,n} - \tilde{\Theta}_{i,n}\big)\Delta \mathrm{T}^{\mathbf{M}^*_n, \tilde{\Theta}_{i,n}}_{i,n} \quad \overset{\text{st-}\mathcal{D}}{\to} \quad \Big(T \int_0^T V_{\theta^*_s} ds\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{N}(0,1), \tag{19}$$

$$n^{\frac{1}{l}}T^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{B_n}\left(\hat{\tilde{\Theta}}_{i,n}^{\mathbf{M}_{i,n}^0}\Delta\mathrm{T}_{i,n}^{\mathbf{M}_{i,n}^0,\tilde{\Theta}_{i,n}}-\hat{\tilde{\Theta}}_{i,n}^{\mathbf{M}_n^*}\Delta\mathrm{T}_{i,n}^{\mathbf{M}_n^*,\tilde{\Theta}_{i,n}}\right)\ \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}}\ 0, \tag{20}$$

$$n^{\frac{1}{l}}\sum_{i=1}^{B_n}\left(\widehat{\Theta}_{i,n}\Delta\mathrm{T}_{i,n}-\hat{\tilde{\Theta}}_{i,n}^{\mathbf{M}_{i,n}^0}\Delta\mathrm{T}_{i,n}^{\mathbf{M}_{i,n}^0,\tilde{\Theta}_{i,n}}\right)\ \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}}\ 0. \tag{21}$$

Note that if the sampling times are not regular, V_{θ^*} will most likely be different from the variance of the parametric estimator. For instances of this when estimating volatility, one can look at Corollary 2.30 on p.154 in Mykland and Zhang (2012), where the "Asymptotic Quadratic Variation of Time" alters the variance of the RV estimator.

In the following, we provide six conditions. Condition (E1) - Condition (E4) are used to prove (17) - (19). Moreover, (20) is proven with Condition (E5). Finally, we can show (21) assuming Condition (E6). We make the first assumption, which is on observation times.

Condition (E1). The observation times are such that for $k = 1, 2, 4, 8$

$$\sup_{1\leq i\leq N_n}\mathbb{E}_{\tau_{i-1,n}}\left[(\Delta\tau_{i,n})^k\right]=O_p(n^{-k}). \tag{22}$$

Remark 1. (practicability) Condition (E1) is used in the proof of (17) and (19).

Remark 2. (block length) As an obvious consequence of (22) when $k = 1$, we have that the block length is such that $\mathbb{E}\left[\Delta\mathrm{T}_{i,n}\right]=O(h_n n^{-1})$.

Remark 3. Note that condition (E1) is satisfied by the general endogenous HBT model introduced in Potiron and Mykland (2015).

We make a second assumption on the observation times, which is due to non regularity of arrival times. We make sure that when the initial Markov-chain is fixed to $\mathbf{M}_n^*$, we can bound the difference in length between the approximated block and the true block, uniformly in the block initial value parameter θ_0 and the path of the parameter process θ_t. Let $M > 0$ and $i = 1, \cdots, B_n$. For any $\theta_t \in \mathcal{E}_{M,n}^{(i)}$, $\mathbf{M} \in \mathcal{M}_{m,n}$ and $\mathbf{N} \in \mathcal{M}_{m,n}$, we define the difference in block length expectation as

$$E_{i,n}^{\mathbf{M},\mathbf{N},\theta_t}:=\mathbb{E}\left[\Delta\mathrm{T}_{i,n}^{\mathbf{M},\theta_0}-\Delta\mathrm{T}_{i,n}^{\mathbf{N},\theta_t}\right],$$

and the difference variance as

$$V_{i,n}^{\mathbf{M},\mathbf{N},\theta_t}:=\mathrm{Var}\left[\Delta\mathrm{T}_{i,n}^{\mathbf{M},\theta_0}-\Delta\mathrm{T}_{i,n}^{\mathbf{N},\theta_t}\right].$$

Condition (E2). For any $M > 0$, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{B_n} \sup_{\theta_t \in \mathcal{E}_{M,n}^{(i)}} \left| E_{i,n}^{\mathbf{M}_n^*, \mathbf{M}_{i,n}^0, \theta_t} \right| = o_p(n^{-\frac{1}{l}}), \tag{23}$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{B_n} \sup_{\theta_t \in \mathcal{E}_{M,n}^{(i)}} V_{i,n}^{\mathbf{M}_n^*, \mathbf{M}_{i,n}^0, \theta_t} = o_p(n^{-\frac{2}{l}}). \tag{24}$$

Remark 4. (practicability) Condition (E2) is used to obtain (18) and (19). The reader can refer to Remark 21 to understand the practicability of Condition (E2). The reason why there is a sum in (23) and (24) is the introduction of the past-dependence term in the model. If the model is simple enough so that

$$\sup_{(\theta_t, V, \mathbf{M}, \mathbf{N}) \in \mathcal{E}_{M,n} \times \mathcal{M}_{m,n}^2} \left| E_{V,n}^{\mathbf{M}, \mathbf{N}, \theta_t} \right| = o_p(h_n n^{-1-\frac{1}{l}}), \tag{25}$$

$$\sup_{(\theta_t, V, \mathbf{M}, \mathbf{N}) \in \mathcal{E}_{M,n} \times \mathcal{M}_{m,n}^2} V_{V,n}^{\mathbf{M}, \mathbf{N}, \theta_t} = o_p(h_n n^{-1-\frac{2}{l}}), \tag{26}$$

where $E_{V,n}^{\mathbf{M},\mathbf{N},\theta_t}$ and $V_{V,n}^{\mathbf{M},\mathbf{N},\theta_t}$ are defined as $E_{i,n}^{\mathbf{M},\mathbf{N},\theta_t}$ and $V_{i,n}^{\mathbf{M},\mathbf{N},\theta_t}$ when taking V as innovation, then Condition (E2) is satisfied. Depending on the model, $\mathcal{M}_{m,n}$ can be very large, and thus it might be impossible to obtain (25) and (26). In Condition (E2), (23) and (24) can be seen as average, in the initial block value, of the expressions (25) and (26).

The following assumption provides the existence of a $l' > 0$ such that the convergence rate of the parametric estimator is $n^{\frac{1}{l'}}$. In most examples, such as the MLE under regular conditions, we have $l' = 2$. Condition (E3) also assumes that the parametric estimator is not too biased. For that purpose, we introduce the definition of the bias on the ith block $B_{i,n}^{\mathbf{M},\theta} := \mathbb{E}\big[\big(\hat{\theta}_{h_n,n}(R_{i,n}^{1,\mathbf{M},\theta}; \cdots; R_{i,n}^{h_n,\mathbf{M},\theta}; \mathbf{R}) - \theta\big)\Delta \mathrm{T}_{i,n}^{\mathbf{M},\theta}\big]$ for any $\mathbf{M} \in \mathcal{M}_{m,n}$ and any $\theta \in K$.

Condition (E3). For any parameter $\theta \in K$, we assume that there exists a covariance matrix $V_\theta > 0$ such that for any $M > 0$, we have V_θ is bounded for any $\theta \in K_M$ and

uniformly in $\theta \in K_M$ and in $i = 1, \cdots, B_n$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{Var}\left[h_n^{\frac{1}{l'}}\left(\hat{\theta}_{h_n,n}(R_{i,n}^{1,\mathbf{M}_n^*,\theta};\cdots;R_{i,n}^{h_n,\mathbf{M}_n^*,\theta};\mathbf{R}_n^*)-\theta\right)\Delta\mathrm{T}_{i,n}^{\mathbf{M}_n^*,\theta}\right] &= V_\theta \mathbb{E}\left[\Delta\mathrm{T}_{i,n}^{\mathbf{M}_n^*,\theta}\right] T h_n n^{-1} \\
&\quad + o(h_n^2 n^{-2}) \qquad (27)\\
\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\left(\hat{\theta}_{h_n,n}(R_{i,n}^{1,\mathbf{M}_n^*,\theta};\cdots;R_{i,n}^{h_n,\mathbf{M}_n^*,\theta};\mathbf{R}_n^*)-\theta\right)\Delta\mathrm{T}_{i,n}^{\mathbf{M}_n^*,\theta}\right)^4\right] &= O(h_n^{4-\frac{4}{l'}} n^{-4}) \qquad (28)\\
B_{i,n}^{\mathbf{M}_n^*,\theta} &= o(h_n n^{-1-\frac{1}{l}}) \qquad (29)
\end{aligned}$$

Remark 5. (practicability) Condition (E3) is used to show (19). To understand the usefulness of Condition (E3), the reader should refer to Remark 19. Condition (E3) is more involved than Condition (C1) for two reasons. First, a more general model than in Section 9.1 is considered. Moreover, the limit distribution is investigated instead of the simple consistency.

Remark 6. (regular observations case) The reader might get confused when first considering the random block length term $\Delta\mathrm{T}_{i,n}^{\mathbf{M}_n^*,\theta}$ showing up in (27), (28) and (29). One should keep in mind that in the simple case where observations are regularly spaced, we have $\Delta\mathrm{T}_{i,n}^{\mathbf{M}_n^*,\theta} := T h_n n^{-1}$. In that case, (27) only assumes that the parametric estimator normalized error variance converges uniformly. Furthermore, (28) assumes that the fourth moment of the normalized error has bounded expectation. Finally, (29) asserts that the parametric estimator used on a block of h_n observations has a bias (in the usual sense of the definition) of order at most $o(n^{-\frac{1}{l}})$. We assume now that $l = 2$ and $l' = 2$. As we have that $h_n = o(n^{\frac{1}{2}})$ in view of (30), we obtain that the parametric estimator bias must be of order $o(h_n^{-1})$. The MLE bias is of order $O(h_n^{-1})$ and thus (29) is not satisfied. Nonetheless, it is easy to correct for the first-order bias (see, e.g., Firth(1993)) and thus obtain a first-order bias-corrected estimator with bias of order $O(h_n^{-2})$, which satisfies (29) if h_n is chosen such that $n^{\frac{1}{4}} = o(h_n)$. In the case where observations are not regular, the presence of the random block length term $\Delta\mathrm{T}_{i,n}^{\mathbf{M}_n^*,\theta}$ doesn't seem to make Condition (E3) harder to verify than in the regular case, at least in the model with uncertainty zones (See Appendix 12.6 for details).

We make a fourth assumption, which is on the block size h_n. In practice, Condition (E4) provides us with the maximum block size h_n to use for constant approximation of parameter. Note that in the most common case when $l = 2$ and $l' = 2$, (31) is automatically verified. Also in that case, (30) can be written as $h_n = o(n^{\frac{1}{2}})$, which

is the same block size order found in Mykland and Zhang (2011), who investigated how constant we can hold volatility in a small neighborhood in the case of regular observations of the price following a continuous Itô-process.

Condition (E4). The block size h_n is such that

$$n^{\frac{1}{l}-1}h_n = o(1), \tag{30}$$

$$n^{\frac{2}{l}-1}h_n^{1-\frac{2}{l'}} \to 1. \tag{31}$$

Remark 7. (practicability) Condition (E4) is used in the proof of (17) and (19).

The next condition assumes that through uniformity in the parameter value and future parameter path, we can bound the discrepancy of the parametric model starting with two different initial vectors. Let $M > 0$. For any $\theta \in K_M$, $\mathbf{M}_1 \in \mathcal{M}_{m,n}$ and $\mathbf{M}_2 \in \mathcal{M}_{m,n}$, we introduce the difference bias on the ith block as

$$\begin{aligned} E_{i,n}^{\mathbf{M}_1,\mathbf{M}_2,\theta} := \mathbb{E}\Big[&\hat{\theta}_{h_n,n}(R_{i,n}^{1,\mathbf{M}_1,\theta},\cdots,R_{i,n}^{h_n,\mathbf{M}_1,\theta};\mathbf{R}_1)\Delta \mathrm{T}_{i,n}^{\mathbf{M}_1,\theta} \\ &-\hat{\theta}_{h_n,n}(R_{i,n}^{1,\mathbf{M}_2,\theta},\cdots,R_{i,n}^{h_n,\mathbf{M}_2,\theta};\mathbf{R}_2)\Delta \mathrm{T}_{i,n}^{\mathbf{M}_2,\theta}\Big], \end{aligned}$$

and the difference variance as

$$\begin{aligned} V_{i,n}^{\mathbf{M}_1,\mathbf{M}_2,\theta} := \mathrm{Var}\Big[&\hat{\theta}_{h_n,n}(R_{i,n}^{1,\mathbf{M}_1,\theta},\cdots,R_{i,n}^{h_n,\mathbf{M}_1,\theta};\mathbf{R}_1)\Delta \mathrm{T}_{i,n}^{\mathbf{M}_1,\theta} \\ &-\hat{\theta}_{h_n,n}(R_{i,n}^{1,\mathbf{M}_2,\theta},\cdots,R_{i,n}^{h_n,\mathbf{M}_2,\theta};\mathbf{R}_2)\Delta \mathrm{T}_{i,n}^{\mathbf{M}_2,\theta}\Big], \end{aligned}$$

Condition (E5). For any $M > 0$ we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{B_n} \sup_{\theta\in K_M} \left|E_{i,n}^{\mathbf{M}_{i,n}^0,\mathbf{M}_n^*,\theta}\right| = o_p(n^{-\frac{1}{l}}), \tag{32}$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{B_n} \sup_{\theta\in K_M} V_{i,n}^{\mathbf{M}_{i,n}^0,\mathbf{M}_n^*,\theta} = o_p(n^{-\frac{2}{l}}). \tag{33}$$

Remark 8. (practicability) Condition ($E5$) is used to show (20). The reader can refer to Remark 4 for more details on why we choose to use sums in (32) and (33) instead of uniformity in the block initial value.

The last condition is very similar to Condition (E5), except that we are not looking at the discrepancy induced by different initial vectors but rather the difference between the time-varying parameter model and the parametric model when initial vectors are equal. For that reason, we provide the following definitions. Let $i = 1, \cdots, B_n$ be the block number. For any $M > 0$, any $\theta_t \in \mathcal{E}_{M,n}^{(1),i}$ and any $\mathbf{M} \in \mathcal{M}_{m,n}$, we introduce the difference bias on the ith block as

$$\begin{aligned} E_{i,n}^{\mathbf{M},\theta_t} &:= \mathbb{E}\big[\big(\hat{\theta}_{h_n,n}(R_{i,n}^{1,\mathbf{M},\theta_t}, \cdots, R_{i,n}^{h_n,\mathbf{M},\theta_t}; \mathbf{R})\Delta \mathrm{T}_{i,n}^{\mathbf{M},\theta_t} \\ &\quad -\hat{\theta}_{h_n,n}(R_{i,n}^{1,\mathbf{M},\theta_0}, \cdots, R_{i,n}^{h_n,\mathbf{M},\theta_0}; \mathbf{R})\Delta \mathrm{T}_{i,n}^{\mathbf{M},\theta_0}\big], \end{aligned}$$

as well as the variance of the difference

$$\begin{aligned} V_{i,n}^{\mathbf{M},\theta_t} &:= \mathrm{Var}\left[\big(\hat{\theta}_{h_n,n}(R_{i,n}^{1,\mathbf{M},\theta_t}, \cdots, R_{i,n}^{h_n,\mathbf{M},\theta_t}; \mathbf{R})\Delta \mathrm{T}_{i,n}^{\mathbf{M},\theta_t} \right. \\ &\quad \left. -\hat{\theta}_{h_n,n}(R_{i,n}^{1,\mathbf{M},\theta_0}, \cdots, R_{i,n}^{h_n,\mathbf{M},\theta_0}; \mathbf{R})\Delta \mathrm{T}_{i,n}^{\mathbf{M},\theta_0}\big]. \end{aligned}$$

Condition (E6). For any $M > 0$, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{B_n} \sup_{\theta_t \in \mathcal{E}_{M,n}^{(1),i}} \left| E_{i,n}^{\mathbf{M}_{i,n}^0,\theta_t} \right| = o_p(n^{-\frac{1}{l}}), \tag{34}$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{B_n} \sup_{\theta_t \in \mathcal{E}_{M,n}^{(1),i}} V_{i,n}^{\mathbf{M}_{i,n}^0,\theta_t} = o_p(n^{-\frac{2}{l}}). \tag{35}$$

Remark 9. (practicability) Condition (E6) is used to show (21). One should refer to Remark 8.

We now state the main theorem of this paper, which investigates the limit distribution of (16).

Theorem (Central limit theorem). *Assume Condition (E0) - Condition (E6). Then, stably in law as* $n \to \infty$,

$$n^{\frac{1}{l}}\big(\widehat{\Theta}_n - \Theta\big) \to \Big(T^{-1}\int_0^T V_{\theta_s^*} ds\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{N}(0,1). \tag{36}$$

Remark 10. (parametric model with regular observations) Note that in the case where observations are regular and the time-varying parameter model is equal to the parametric model with true parameter θ^*, the asymptotic variance of $\widehat{\Theta}_n$ is equal to the variance of the parametric model, i.e.

$$n^{\frac{1}{l}}\big(\widehat{\Theta}_n - \Theta\big) \to V_{\theta^*}^{\frac{1}{2}}\, \mathcal{N}(0,1).$$

Remark 11. (convergence rate and asymptotic variance) In most examples, we have that $l = 2$, which is the best convergence rate in the parametric model. In view of (31) in Condition $(E4)$, in that case we also have $l' = 2$ and thus the convergence rate in (36) is the best attainable (Gloter and Jacod (2001)). If we also assume that we have a parametric estimator which achieves the Cramér-Rao bound of efficiency, we conjecture that the variance in the right term of (36) is the nonparametric efficient bound, at least in the case where there is no endogeneity.

Remark 12. (MLE) The MLE is a natural and popular estimator. In order for the practitioner to be able to apply the local MLE and show the associated central limit theorem, one has to keep in mind that in finite sample, the MLE is biased, with a bias magnitude of the order of the number of observations inverse. To verify bias conditions (29), (32) and (34), one has to apply a first-order bias correction to the MLE discussed for instance in Firth (1993). This correction is easy to obtain.

Remark 13. (block size) Condition (E4) provides the asymptotic order to use for the block size h_n. Thus, it gives a rule basis to use on finite sample, but it is left to the practitioner to ultimitalely choose h_n. If the parametric estimator is badly biased, the practitioner should increase the value of h_n. Also, if the parameter process θ_t^* seems not to be moving a lot, h_n can be chosen to be bigger. In Section 7.2, we can see on the model with uncertainty zones that the estimated volatility is robust to the value of h_n if we choose $h_n \approx N_n^{\frac{1}{2}}$.

Remark 14. (subset parameter estimation) In practice, one can be interested in estimating only a p'-dimensional integrated parameter Ξ, where $p' \in \{1, \cdots, p-1\}$ and Ξ is a subset of Θ. If we define in analogy with the quantities depending on θ_t^* the p'-dimensional subquantities ξ_t^*, $\hat{\xi}_{k,n}$, $\Xi_{i,n}$, $\widehat{\Xi}_{i,n}$ $\widehat{\Xi}_n$ as well as the $p' \times p'$-dimensional matrix V_ξ, the Central Limit Theorem still holds in that case under the same assumptions

$$n^{\frac{1}{l}}\big(\widehat{\Xi}_n - \Xi\big) \to \Big(T^{-1}\int_0^T V_{\theta_s^*} ds\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{N}(0,1).$$

Remark 15. (estimating the asymptotic variance) If the practitioner doesn't have a (parametric) variance estimator at hand and that her parametric estimator can be written as in Mykland and Zhang (2014), one can use the techniques of the cited paper to obtain a variance estimate. Investigating if such techniques would work in

our setting is beyond the scope of this paper. If she has a variance estimator $\hat{v}_{h_n,n}$, then for any $i = 1, \cdots, B_n$ she can estimate the ith block variance $\widehat{V}_{i,n}$ as $\widehat{V}_{i,n} := \hat{v}_{h_n,n}(R^1_{i,n}; \cdots; R^{h_n}_{i,n}; \mathbf{R}^0_{i,n})$, and the asymptotic variance as the weighted sum

$$\widehat{V}_n = T^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^{B_n} \widehat{V}_{i,n} \Delta \mathrm{T}_{i,n}. \tag{37}$$

Under conditions similar to the ones in Section 9.2 and Section 4, we can obtain the consistency of (37).

Remark 16. (adding a drift to the parameter) It is left to the econometrician to check if θ^*_t can follow a continuous Itô-process with drift. In the examples of this paper, we were able to add a drift following the techniques in Remark 22.

5 Application in time series: the MA(1) example

To illustrate possible practical applications of our method, we consider a time series model in this section. We are not interested in theoretical aspects and will not attempt to show the CLT. Rather, we explain why for a general economic time series our method can perform better than some popular approaches used by the practitioners. We then discuss the practical applications of the findings in Section 4. Finally, we carry numerical simulations in the MA(1) example. We describe first the general time series setting. We assume that there is an economic parameter ν such that the time-varying parameter is a noisy version of ν, which oscillates randomly around it in the sense that $\Theta \approx \nu$.

We describe now why some usual methods in time series might be limited in such a situation. The first method uses a global estimator regardless of the time-varying parameter setting. First, this approach will most likely provide a bias. Second, this bias cannot be identifiable, even with Monte Carlo simulations, because the time-varying parameter path is unknown. In the following, numerical simulations document such bias for the MLE in the MA(1) model.

The second method, the naïve local approach, consists in fitting the model on a block with less observations (e.g. the previous 500 observations instead of the previous

10000 observations) so that the parameter is roughly constant on that block. There are several problems coming with that approach. The estimated quantity is θ_T^*, which can be much different from ν. Also, the block size to use is arbitrary, and the standard deviation is bigger. We also investigate this strategy on numerical simulations in the following.

The third approach consists in fitting time-varying parameter models. For instance, the econometrician could try a time-varying parameter model where the 1-dimensional parameter follows for instance a cos function. As θ_t^* is a noisy version of ν, its path structure is unpredictable and trying to fit it will most likely overfit the model. In practice, the econometrician should first choose the best model prior to using the techniques of this paper. If she/he prefers a time-varying parameter model with a cos function parameter, then this time-varying parameter model will be considered as the original parametric model (in the terminology of this paper), and the time-varying parameters will be associated to the parameters of this new parametric model (e.g. the 2-dimensional time-varying parameters will be equal to the time-varying amplitude and the time-varying period instead of the original one-dimensional time-varying parameter).

We discuss now the important practical implications of the findings in Section 4. We assume that the rate of convergence of the parametric estimator is $l = 2$, which is true for most examples. First, in view of Condition (E4), the block size h_n should be bounded by $n^{\frac{1}{2}}$. Second, the parametric estimator should be bias-corrected. In view of the decomposition (16), we can disentangle the bias of $\widehat{\Theta}_{i,n}$ on first approximation as the sum of two terms, namely the bias of the parametric estimator and the bias due to the fact that the parameter is time-varying. The former can be corrected by the econometrician, and we define the bias-corrected local estimate $\widehat{\Theta}_{i,n}^{(BC)}$ accordingly. On the contrary, as the path of the parameter is unknown, we cannot correct for the latter. This is one reason why we have to work with a $h_n < n^{\frac{1}{2}}$. The theory of Section 4 shows that the normalized latter bias will vanish asymptotically under that condition. Conversely, the econometrician who chooses to work locally with $h_n > n^{\frac{1}{2}}$ will most likely obtain a significant latter bias which she cannot identify, and correcting for the former bias might not improve the estimation in that case.

We propose now to look at those statistical questions on numerical simulations and consider the MA(1) example. We define $\widehat{\Theta}_{i,n}$ the MLE estimator applied to the ith block, and its bias-corrected version $\widehat{\Theta}_{i,n}^{(BC)} = \widehat{\Theta}_{i,n} - b(\widehat{\Theta}_{i,n})$, where the bias function $b(\theta)$ was derived in p.86 of Tanaka (1984) and more recently on p. 174 in Cordeiro and Klein (1994). Correspondingly, we define the bias-corrected LPE as

$$\widehat{\Theta}_n^{(BC)} = \frac{1}{T}\sum_{i=1}^{B_n} \widehat{\Theta}_{i,n}^{(BC)} \Delta \mathrm{T}_{i,n}.$$

For the sake of simplicity, we assume that the MA(1) has null-mean, and thus the time-varying parameter can be expressed as $\theta_t^* = (\beta_t, \kappa_t)$. We also assume that the noisy parameter follows a cos function $\theta_t^* = \nu + A\cos(\frac{2\pi t\delta}{T})$, where $\nu = (\nu^{(\beta)}, \nu^{(\kappa)})$ is the economic parameter, $A = (A^{(\beta)}, A^{(\kappa)})$ corresponds to the amplitude, and $\delta = (\delta^{(\beta)}, \delta^{(\kappa)})$ stands for the number of oscillations on $[0, T]$. We consider the number of observations $n = 10000$, and thus choose the block size $h_n = n^{0.4999} \approx 100$. We simulate 100 different paths.

We fix the economic parameter $\nu = (.5, 1)$ and the amplitude $A = (.2, .4)$. For a setting with a small number of oscillations $\delta = (4, 4)$ and one with a bigger number of oscillations $\delta = (10, 10)$, we compare the performance of the global MLE estimator $\widehat{\Theta}_n^{(MLE)}$, the local estimator on the previous 500 observations $\widehat{\Theta}_n^{(500)}$, the non bias-corected LPE $\widehat{\Theta}_n$ and the bias-corrected LPE $\widehat{\Theta}_n^{(BC)}$ with various block sizes $h_n = 25, 100, 500, 1000, 2000, 5000$. The results can be found in Table 1 and Table 2. As expected from the theory, $\widehat{\Theta}_n$ performs very well when $h_n = 100$, and the bias-corrected version is much better. The case $h_n = 25$ allows us to check what can happen when we have blocks with very few observations. The bias-corrected estimator performs well to estimate $\nu^{(\kappa)}$, but somehow the bias-correction to estimate $\nu^{(\beta)}$ doesn't provide better estimates. This is most likely due to the fact that we have not enough observations on each block. The estimation made with $h_n = 500$ is very decent in the case where we don't have many oscillations. The bias-corrected estimator is actually not as good. This corroborates the theory that when $h_n >> 100$ the main source of bias is due to the parameter which is time-varying rather than the parametric estimator bias itself. If we have a bigger number of oscillations, the estimates are not as accurate. When using

bigger h_n, we see the same pattern, and the accuracy of the estimation decreases as h_n increases. Finally, the naïve estimators $\widehat{\Theta}_n^{(MLE)}$ and $\widehat{\Theta}_n^{(500)}$ are far off.

6 Estimating volatility with a local MA(1) model

In this section, we first point out a well-known example where the MA(1) appears as a local model in high-frequency data. We then discuss possible applications to estimate volatility using a slight modification of the local MLE estimator introduced in Section 5. As in Section 5, we don't focus on the theoretical side, don't attempt to get into details or to show the conditions of Section 4.

We assume that the observations occur at regular times $\tau_{i,n} = \frac{i}{n}T$, thus that the number of observations is $N_n = n$. We assume that the efficient price is a null-drift continuous Itô-process

$$X_t := \int_0^t \sigma_s dW_s, \tag{38}$$

where W_t is a standard Brownian motion and σ_t^2 is the volatility process, and that there is microstructure noise which means that we observe $X_{\tau_{i,n}} + \epsilon_{\tau_{i,n}}$, where the noise $\epsilon_t := n^{-\frac{1}{2}} v_t^{\frac{1}{2}} \gamma_t$, the noise variance v_t is time-varying, and γ_t are IID standard normally distributed and independent from the efficient process X_t. Consequently, the returns are defined as

$$R_{i,n} := \Delta X_{\tau_{i,n}} + \epsilon_{\tau_{i,n}} - \epsilon_{\tau_{i-1,n}}. \tag{39}$$

The parameter process is defined as the two-dimensional volatility and noise variance process $\theta_t^* := (\sigma_t^2, v_t)$. We are interested in the estimation of $\Theta := \big(\int_0^T \sigma_t^2 dt, \int_0^T v_t dt \big)$. First, note that the model (39) can be written as a LPM of order $m = 1$ with

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{i,n} &:= \epsilon_{\tau_{i,n}}, \\ R_{i,n} &:= \Delta X_{\tau_{i,n}} + \epsilon_{\tau_{i,n}} - \epsilon_{\tau_{i-1,n}}, \\ U_{i,n} &:= (\{\Delta W_{[\tau_{i-1,n},s]}\}_{\tau_{i-1,n} \le s \le \tau_{i,n}}, \gamma_{\tau_{i,n}}). \end{aligned}$$

We want to show that $R_{i,n}$ is locally a MA(1) model, i.e. if we assume that the parameter is constant equal to (σ^2, v) we want to show that the returns $R_{i,n}$ follow

a MA(1) process. In the parametric case, we can compute the mean $\mathbb{E}\big[R_{i,n}\big] = 0$, the variance function $\text{Var}\big[R_{i,n}\big] := \frac{\sigma^2 T+2v}{n}$, the auto-covariance function for lag 1 which is equal to $\mathbb{E}\big[R_{i,n}R_{i-1,n}\big] := -v$, and the auto-covariance function for lag k with $k \geq 2$ which is equal to 0. Define $G : \mathbb{R}_*^- \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $G(x) = -\frac{1}{x} - x^2$. We can rewrite (39) as a MA(1) model

$$R_{i,n} := \varepsilon_{i,n} + \beta\varepsilon_{i-1,n},$$

where $\beta := G^{-1}\big(\frac{\sigma^2 T}{v} + 2\big)$ and $\varepsilon_{i,n}$ are IID normal with variance $\kappa_n := -\frac{v}{n\beta}$, and thus the returns follow locally a MA(1) process. Locally, there is a $1-1$ correspondence between the volatility and the noise variance on the one hand and the two parameters of the MA(1) model on the other hand. In particular, if we fit a MA(1) model locally and obtain the parameters $(\hat{\beta}_{i,n}, \hat{\kappa}_{i,n})$ on the ith block, we can estimate the local volatility and noise variance from the estimated parameters as $(\hat{\sigma}^2_{i,n}, \hat{v}_{i,n}) = H(\hat{\beta}_{i,n}, \hat{\kappa}_{i,n})$, where $H(x, y) = (2 - G(x))\frac{nx}{Ty}, -\frac{nx}{y})$.

Xiu (2010) used this $1-1$ correspondence and showed that we can still use the global MLE of MA(1) when volatility is time-varying and noise variance non time-varying. He showed the consistency and the associated limit distribution of the QMLE[11]. The techniques of the current paper can allow us to go one step further by allowing time-varying noise variance[12]. We can estimate local MA(1) parameters $(\hat{\sigma}^2_{i,n}, \hat{v}_{i,n})$ with a bias-corrected local MLE $\widehat{\Theta}^{(BC)}_{i,n}$. Then, we estimate locally the volatility and the noise variance as a function of the parameters $(\hat{\sigma}^2_{i,n}, \hat{v}_{i,n}) = H(\hat{\beta}_{i,n}, \hat{\kappa}_{i,n})$, and finally take a weighted sum of them as in (8).

7 Estimating volatility using the model with uncertainty zones

This section provides the main application of the theory introduced in Section 4. We introduce a time-varying friction parameter extension to the model with uncertainty

[11] This was done in a slightly different asymptotic setting than in this example, i.e. with the noise component not shrinking to 0 asymptotically

[12] Note that when both the volatility and the noise are time-varying, the model (39) is more complicated than the time-varying MA(1) model introduced in Section 2.5

zones introduced in Robert and Rosenbaum (2011) to estimate volatility and show that conditions of Section 4 are satisfied in that case. Consequently, we obtain the corresponding CLT. Finally, we provide an empirical sketch. The reader who wants to see another example from the high-frequency data literature where conditions of Section 4 are satisfied can consult Section 11. Moreover, the reader should refer to Section 10.1 for some notation used in the following.

7.1 The model and the CLT

We introduce the model with uncertainty zones. There is microstructure noise in this model. Let $Z_{\tau_{i,n},n}$ be the last traded price. In a frictionless market, we can assume that a trade with 1-tick increment of the price will occur when the efficient price process crosses the mid-tick value $Z_{\tau_{i,n},n} + \frac{\alpha_n}{2}$ (and a trade with 1-tick decrement of the price when crossing the value $Z_{\tau_{i,n},n} - \frac{\alpha_n}{2}$).

In practice, the absolute value of the increment (or the decrement) of the observed price can be bigger than the tick size α_n. For that reason, the authors introduced the discrete variables $L_{i,n}$ that stand for the absolute size, in tick number, of the next price change. Thus, the next traded price which corresponds to a price change will be $Z_{\tau_{i+1,n}} = Z_{\tau_{i,n}} \pm \alpha_n L_{i,n}$. They also introduced a continuous (possibly multidimensional) time-varying parameter χ_t, and assume that conditional on the past, $L_{i,n}$ take values on $\{1, \cdots, m\}$ with

$$\mathbb{P}_{\tau_{i,n}}(L_{i,n} = k) = p_k(\chi_{\tau_{i,n}}) \ , \ k = 1, \cdots, m,$$

for some unknown positive differentiable with bounded derivative functions p_k. We assume that the time-varying parameter is a null-drift Itô-process $d\chi_t := \sigma_t^\chi dW_t^\chi$, where the volatility σ_t^χ is continuous.

Also, the frictions induce that the transactions will not occur exactly when the efficient process is equal to the mid-tick values. For this purpose, in the notation of Robert and Rosenbaum (2012), let $0 < \eta < 1$ be a parameter that quantifies the aversion to price change. The frictionless non-realistic case would correspond to $\eta := 0$. Conversely, if η is closer to 1, the agents are very averse to trade. If we let $X_t^{(\alpha)}$ be

the value of X_t rounded to the nearest multiple of α, the sampling times are defined recursively as $\tau_{0,n} := 0$ and for any positive integer i

$$\tau_{i,n} := \inf\Big\{t > \tau_{i-1,n} : X_t = X^{(\alpha_n)}_{\tau_{i-1,n}} - \alpha_n\big(L_{i-1,n} - \frac{1}{2} + \eta\big)$$

$$\text{or } X_t = X^{(\alpha_n)}_{\tau_{i-1,n}} + \alpha_n\big(L_{i-1,n} - \frac{1}{2} + \eta\big)\Big\}.$$

Correspondingly, the observed price is assumed to be equal to the rounded efficient price $Z_{\tau_{i,n}} := X^{(\alpha_n)}_{\tau_{i,n}}$.

To express the model with uncertainty zones as a LPM, we consider when $\mu_t := (\eta, \chi_t)$. Thus, we have that $\theta^*_t := (\sigma^2_t, \eta, \chi_t)$. We are not interested in estimating directly χ_t and thus we follow Remark 14 and consider the subparameter $\xi^*_t = (\sigma_t, \eta)$ to be estimated. Following the setting of this paper, we will assume that η is a time-varying parameter η_t and we will extend the model with uncertainty zones in (40). We call this extension the time-varying friction parameter model with uncertainty zones. The sampling times are defined recursively as $\tau_{i,n} := 0$ and for any positive integer i

$$\tau_{i,n} := \inf\Big\{t > \tau_{i-1,n} : X_t = X^{(\alpha_n)}_{\tau_{i-1,n}} - \alpha_n\big(L_{i,n} - \frac{1}{2} + \eta_{\tau_{i-1,n}}\big)$$

$$\text{or } X_t = X^{(\alpha_n)}_{\tau_{i-1,n}} + \alpha_n\big(L_{i,n} - \frac{1}{2} + \eta_{\tau_{i-1,n}}\big)\Big\}. \tag{40}$$

The idea behind the time-varying friction model with uncertainty zones is similar to (63), we hold the parameter η_t constant between two observations.

We recall that the target quantity is the integrated parameter $\Xi := (\int_0^T \sigma^2_t dt, \int_0^T \eta_t dt)$. We define the unobserved returns as $Q_{i,n} := L_{i,n}$ and the observed returns as $R_{i,n} := (\Delta Z_{\tau_{i,n}}, \Delta\tau_{i,n})$. The order of memory is $m := 1$. The random innovation is defined as the two-dimensional path $U_{i,n} := ((\Delta W_{[\tau_{i-1,n},t]})_{t\geq\tau_{i-1,n}}, (\Delta W'_{[\tau_{i-1,n},t]})_{t\geq\tau_{i-1,n}})$ where the jump size $L_{i,n}$ is a function of W'_t, which is a Brownian motion independent of the other quantities and which was introduced in p.11 of Robert and Rosenbaum (2012). We also define

$$w^+ := \inf\Big\{t > 0 : \int_0^t \sigma_s du^{(1)}_s = -\alpha_n\big(q - 1 + 2\eta_0\big) \text{ or } \int_0^t \sigma_s du^{(1)}_s = \alpha_n q\Big\}$$

and

$$w^- := \inf\Big\{t > 0 : \int_0^t \sigma_s du_s^{(1)} = -\alpha_n q \text{ or } \int_0^t \sigma_s du_s^{(1)} = \alpha_n\big(q - 1 + 2\eta_0\big)\Big\}.$$

Furthermore, we define

$$w := w^+ \mathbf{1}_{\{r^{(1)}>0\}} + w^- \mathbf{1}_{\{r^{(1)}<0\}}$$

and

$$y := \sum_{k=1}^{m} k \mathbf{1}\Big\{\phi\big(u_w^{(2)} w^{-\frac{1}{2}}\big) \in \Big[\sum_{j=1}^{k-1} p_j\big(\chi_w\big), \sum_{j=1}^{k} p_j\big(\chi_w\big)\Big]\Big\} \tag{41}$$

where ϕ is the cumulative function of the standard normal distribution. The right hand-side in (41) can be found in p.11 of Robert and Rosenbaum (2012). We can express

$$F_n\big((q, r^{(1)}, r^{(2)}), (u_t^{(1)}, u_t^{(2)}), (\sigma_t^2, \eta_t, \chi_t)\big) := \big(y, \alpha_n q \text{ sign } \big(\int_0^w \sigma_s du_s^{(1)}\big), w\big).$$

We estimate on each block the volatility and the friction parameter using respectively the estimator $\widehat{RV}_{\alpha_n,t}$ and a slight modification of $\hat{\eta}_{\alpha_n,t}$ (see p.8 in Robert and Rosenbaum (2012)) defined as

$$\hat{\eta}_{\alpha,t}^{(m)} := \sum_{k=1}^{m} \lambda_{\alpha,t,k}^{(m)} u_{\alpha,t,k}^{(m)} \tag{42}$$

with

$$\lambda_{\alpha,t,k}^{(m)} := \frac{N_{\alpha,t,k}^{(a)} + N_{\alpha,t,k}^{(c)}}{\sum_{j=1}^{m}\big(N_{\alpha,t,j}^{(a)} + N_{\alpha,t,j}^{(c)}\big)} \text{ and } u_{\alpha,t,k}^{(m)} := \max\left(0, \min\left(1, \frac{1}{2}\Big(k\big(\frac{N_{\alpha,t,k}^{(c)}}{N_{\alpha,t,k}^{(a)}} - 1\big) + 1\Big)\right)\right),$$

where we assume that $\frac{C}{0} := \infty$, and in particular $u_{\alpha,t,k} = 1$ when $N_{\alpha,t,k}^{(a)} = 0$. Note that as $\widehat{RV}_{\alpha_n,t}$ depends on $\hat{\eta}_{\alpha_n,t}^{(m)}$, the estimation of volatility is altered too when using $\hat{\eta}_{\alpha,t}^{(m)}$. We choose to work with this modified estimator for two reasons. First, the definition of $\hat{\eta}_{\alpha,t}$ was unclear when $N_{\alpha,t,k}^{(a)} = 0$ in p.8 of Robert and Rosenbaum (2012). Second, the finite sample bias of $\hat{\eta}_{\alpha,t}^{(m)}$ is slightly smaller with the modified estimator. Asymptotically, they are equivalent and thus all the theory provided in Robert and Rosenbaum (2012) can be used to prove the following theorem.

Theorem (Time-varying friction parameter model with uncertainty zones). *Stably in law as* $n \to \infty$,

$$\alpha_n^{-1}\big(\widehat{\Xi}_n - \Xi\big) \to \Big(T^{-1}\int_0^T V_{\theta_s^*} ds\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{N}(0,1), \tag{43}$$

where V_θ *can be straightforwardly inferred from the definition of Lemma* 4.19 *in p.26 of Robert and Rosenbaum (2012).*

The proof, checking that Condition (E0) - Condition (E6) are satisfied, can be found in Appendix 12.6.

Remark 17. We can add a drift to θ_t^* following the techniques in Remark 22.

Remark 18. Note that, equivalently, the convergence rate in (43) is the usual $n^{\frac{1}{2}}$ when n corresponds to the expected number of observations. One can consult Remark 4 in Potiron and Mykland (2015) for more details.

7.2 Empirical sketch

In this section, we are interested in estimating the integrated parameter in the time-varying friction parameter model with uncertainty zones introduced in Section 7. We remind the reader that the parameter of interest is defined as $\xi_t^* = (\sigma_t^2, \eta_t)$. We are looking at Orange France Telecom stock price on the CAC 40 on Monday March 4th, 2013. The number of returns between 9am and 4pm corresponding to a "change of price" is equal to $N_n = 3306$, and the tick size $\alpha_n = 0.001$ euro. We assume that $T := 1$, consider that $t = 0$ corresponds to 9am and that $t = T$ corresponds to 4pm.

When assuming the non time-varying model with friction parameter equal to η, we can estimate the friction parameter with $\hat{\eta}^{(m)}_{\alpha_n,T}$. We define the standard deviation $s_n(\eta)$ and the standard deviation estimate $\hat{s}_n(\eta)$, where the definition can be found in Appendix 12.7. We estimate the standard deviation as $\hat{s}_n := \hat{s}_n(\hat{\eta}^{(m)}_{\alpha,T})$. We find empirically $\hat{\eta}^{(m)}_{\alpha_n,T} = 0.155$ and $\hat{s}_n = 0.008$. Note that in finite sample, $\hat{\eta}^{(m)}_{\alpha_n,T}$ is biased and that this bias can be estimated following the estimate $\hat{B}$ introduced in Appendix 12.7. Because we choose h_n big enough in this section, the bias is very small and will not alter the values of the estimators and the results of the tests in the following.

We define $\widehat{\Xi}_{i,n} := (\hat{\sigma}^2_{i,n}, \hat{\eta}_{i,n})$ the estimate of ξ^*_t on the ith block. We also define the standard deviation estimate of $\hat{\eta}_{i,n}$ as $\hat{s}_{i,h_n} := s_{i,h_n}(\hat{\eta}_{i,n})$. Note that $\hat{s}_{i,h_n}$ is not block-dependent except for the last block, which is removed from the analysis in the following because the number of observations can be too small in that block. We introduce the notation $\hat{s}_{h_n} := \hat{s}_{1,h_n}$. Figure 1 shows the evolution over time of $\hat{\eta}_{i,n}$ for different values of h_n. Based on those estimates and the standard deviation estimate $\hat{s}_{h_n}$, we compute the associated chi-square statistic

$$\chi^2_n := \sum_{i=1}^{B_n-1} \Big(\frac{\hat{\eta}_{i,n} - \hat{\eta}^{(m)}_{\alpha_n,T}}{\hat{s}_{h_n}} \Big)^2.$$

Under the null hypothesis which states that η_t is non time-varying, χ^2_n follows approximately a chi-square distribution with $B_n - 1$ degrees of freedom. We report χ^2_n for different values of h_n in Table 3. The obtained values indicate that we have strong evidence against the null hypothesis, thus it provides us very good reasons to use the techniques of this paper. Note that this analysis has been carried out on other days and other stocks. Our conclusion is that in almost every case, the friction parameter is time-varying.

We now compute $\widehat{\Xi}_n := (\hat{\sigma}^2_n, \hat{\eta}_n)$ for different values of h_n following the time-varying friction parameter model with uncertainty zones. In view of (31), because $N_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \approx 57.5$ we choose to work with $h_n = 43, \cdots, 63$. We can see in Figure 2 that we obtain different estimates of volatility using the techniques of this work compared to the estimates of the model with uncertainty zones, which is one reason why it is crucial to use a proper time-varying model for η_t. The estimates of the model with uncertainty zones seems to underestimate the integrated volatility. In addition, the RV estimator, which doesn't take account of the microstructure noise, seems to be overestimating the integrated volatility. This is what to be expected in theory and thus indicates that the correction made by $\hat{\sigma}_n$ is reasonable. Finally, the estimates are very similar for different values of h_n, which seems to indicate that the method is robust to small block size variation.

8 Conclusion

We have introduced in this paper a general class of time-varying parameter models called LPM. In particular, if the asset price is assumed to follow a noisy continuous

efficient price, the LPM allows for auto-correlated time-varying noise and correlation between the efficient process, the microstructure noise and the sampling times. If the econometrician has a specific LPM and a parametric estimator at hand, we provided an estimator of the integrated parameter. We also gave conditions under which the econometrician can find the limit distribution.

Depending on the problem, verifying those conditions is not necessarily straightforward. Nonetheless, this paper simplifies consequently the work of the econometrician because she can solve a nonparametric problem using only a parametric estimator. As a matter of example, we showed that we were able to estimate the integrated volatility when assuming a time-varying friction parameter model with uncertainty zones.

From a practical point-of-view, the idea to use local estimates is not new, but this paper investigated the value to use for the tuning parameter h_n. Numerical simulations on the MA(1) corroborated the theory. In the future, we would like to allow the parameter process to follow a general semi-martingale with jumps.

This paper was focused on the estimation of the integrated parameter of the LPM. Condition (E6) states that the normalized discrepancy between the estimator on the observed returns and the approximated returns with the same starting value vanishes asymptotically. Roughly speaking, it means that we can see the LPM as a block-constant parameter model. Thus, we conjecture that parametric tests can also be used. As an example, the log-ratio statistic could test for nested models and provide us evidence on the structure driving the returns. This would most likely enable us to investigate the question of presence of noise in, say, 5-minute returns, the question of correlation between efficient price and noise, the asymmetric information problem using the extension of the model of uncertainty zones in Section 3.2 of Potiron and Mykland (2015), the presence of endogeneity etc.

One other possible application of the fact that the LPM can be seen as a block-constant parameter model is in *model selection*. Given data and a set of candidate LPM, on the one hand we could sum up their block-local maximum likelihood functions. Because of the Markov property of the LPM, we would obtain an estimate of their maximum likelihood function on the whole interval $[0, T]$. On the other hand, we

could build a measure of the integrated volatility of the parameter $\langle \theta^*, \theta^* \rangle_T$, based on techniques used in Mykland and Zhang (2014). Then, we could generalize the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) when parameters are time-varying and LPM could be compared on the basis of their maximum likelihood function and a penalization which would include the number of parameters and the volatility of the parameter.

9 Appendix I: consistency in a simple model

The purpose of this section is to provide an outline of the LPM and the conditions of the CLT by investigating the simpler problem of consistency in the case of a simple model. The reader should refer to it for a deeper understanding of Section 2 and Section 4. Two toy examples, the estimation of volatility with regular no-noisy observations, and the estimation of the rate of a Poisson process, are discussed extensively. Finally, techniques of proofs are also mentioned throughout the section. The obtained conditions are illustrative.

9.1 The simple model

We focus on a simple setting in this section. First, we work with $d_r := 2$. Also, we assume that the observations occur at equidistant time intervals $\Delta\tau_n := \frac{T}{n}$, so that $\tau_{i,n} = \frac{i}{n}T$ and thus $R^{(2)}_{i,n} := \Delta\tau_n$ is deterministic. For the rest of Section 9, we will forget about the second component of the returns $R_{i,n}$, which doesn't provide us any further information, and pretend that $R_{i,n}$ is real-valued. The parametric model is assumed to be very simple. It assumes that there exists a parameter $\theta^* \in K$ such that $R_{i,n}$ are independent and identically distributed (IID) random functions of θ^*. If we introduce $U_{i,n}$ an adequate IID sequence of random variables with distribution U, we can express the returns as

$$R_{i,n} \quad := \quad F_n\big(U_{i,n}, \theta^*\big), \tag{44}$$

where $F_n(x, y)$ is a non-random function. In (44), $U_{i,n}$ can be seen as the *random innovation*.

Since θ^*_t can in fact be time-varying, $R_{i,n}$ don't necessarily follow (44) in the time-varying parameter model. A formal time-varying generalization of (44) will be given in

(47). In general, $R_{i,n}$ are neither identically distributed nor independent. $R_{i,n}$ are not even necessarily conditionally independent given the true parameter process θ_t^*, as we can see in the following two toy examples.

Example 1. (estimating volatility) Consider when $\theta_t^* := \sigma_t^2$ (the volatility is thus assumed to follow (2)), and $R_{i,n} := \int_{\tau_{i-1,n}}^{\tau_{i,n}} \sigma_s dW_s$, where W_t is a standard 1-dimensional Brownian motion. In this case, the parameter space is $K := \mathbb{R}_*^+$. The parametric model assumes $\theta^* := \sigma^2$ and that the distribution of the returns is $R_{i,n} := \sigma \Delta W_{\tau_{i,n}}$, where $\Delta W_{\tau_{i,n}} := W_{\tau_{i,n}} - W_{\tau_{i-1,n}}$ is the increment of the Brownian motion between the $(i-1)$th observation time and the ith observation time and σ^2 is the fixed volatility. Under that assumption, the returns are IID. Under the time-varying parameter model, $R_{i,n}$ are clearly not necessarily IID, and they are also not necessarily conditionally independent given the whole volatility process σ_t^2 if there is a leverage effect.

Example 2. (estimating the rate of a Poisson process) Suppose an econometrician observes data on the number of events (such as trades) in an arbitrary asset, and thinks the number of events happening between 0 and t, N_t, follows a homogeneous Poisson process with rate λ. The parameter rate $\theta_t^* := \lambda_t$ will be assumed to follow (2), with possibly a null-volatility $\sigma_t^\theta = 0$ if the homogeneity assumption turns out to be true. Because the econometrician doesn't have access to the raw data, she can't observe directly the exact time of each event. Instead, she only observes the number of events happening on a period (for instance a ten-minute block) $[\tau_{i-1,n}, \tau_{i,n})$, that is $R_{i,n} = N_{\tau_{i,n}}^- - N_{\tau_{i-1,n}}$. If the econometrician's assumption of homogeneity is true, the returns are IID. In case of heterogeneity, N_t will be a inhomogeneous Poisson process, and the returns $R_{i,n}$ will most likely be neither identically distributed nor independent.

We need to introduce some notation and definitions. On a given block $i = 1, \cdots, B_n$ the observed returns will be called $R_{i,n}^1, \cdots, R_{i,n}^{h_n}$. Formally, it means that $R_{i,n}^j := R_{(i-1)h_n+j,n}$ for any $j = 1, \cdots, h_n$. In analogy with $R_{i,n}^j$, we introduce the approximated returns $\tilde{R}_{i,n}^1, \cdots, \tilde{R}_{i,n}^{h_n}$ on the ith block. We also introduce the corresponding observation times $\tau_{i,n}^j := \tau_{(i-1)h_n+j,n}$ for $j = 0, \cdots, h_n$. Note that $\tau_{i,n}^0 = \tau_{i-1,n}^{h_n}$. Finally, for $j = 1, \cdots, h_n$ we define the time increment between the $(j-1)$th return and the jth return of the ith block as $\Delta\tau_{i,n}^j := \tau_{i,n}^j - \tau_{i,n}^{j-1}$.

We provide a time-varying generalization of the parametric model (44) as well as a formal expression for the approximated returns. To deal with the former, we assume

that in general

$$R_{i,n} \;:=\; F_n\big(U_{i,n}, \{\theta^*_s\}_{\tau_{i-1,n}\leq s\leq \tau_{i,n}}\big). \tag{45}$$

The time-varying parameter model in (45) is a natural extension of the parametric model (44) because the returns $R_{i,n}$ can depend on the parameter process path from the previous sampling time $\tau_{i-1,n}$ to the current sampling time $\tau_{i,n}$. As $R_{i,n}$ depend on the parameter path, it seems natural to allow $U_{i,n}$ to be themselves process paths. For example, when the parameter is equal to the volatility process $\theta^*_t := \sigma^2_t$, we will assume that $U_{i,n}$ are equal to the underlying Brownian motion W_t path (see Example 3 for more details). Also, as $U_{i,n}$ are random innovation, they should be independent of the parameter process path past, but not on the current parameter path. In the case of volatility, it means that we allow for the leverage effect. A simple particular case of (45) is given by

$$R_{i,n} \;:=\; F_n\big(U_{i,n}, \theta^*_{\tau_{i-1,n}}\big), \tag{46}$$

i.e. the returns depend on the parameter path only through its initial value. The time-varying Hitting Constant Boundaries model and the time-varying friction parameter model with uncertainty zones are defined as a mix of (45) and (46) in Section 10.1. Finally, the approximated returns $\tilde{R}_{i,n}$ follow a mixture of the parametric model (44) with initial block parameter value. We are now providing a formal definition of our intuition. We assume that

$$R^j_{i,n} \;:=\; F_n\big(U^j_{i,n}, \{\theta^*_s\}_{\tau^{j-1}_{i,n}\leq s\leq \tau^j_{i,n}}\big), \tag{47}$$

$$\tilde{R}^j_{i,n} \;:=\; F_n\big(U^j_{i,n}, \tilde{\Theta}_{i,n}\big), \tag{48}$$

where the random innovation $U^j_{i,n}$ take values on a space $\mathcal{U}_n$ that can be functional[13] and that can depend on n, $U^j_{i,n}$ are IID for a fixed n but the distribution can depend on n, and $F_n(x,y)$ is a non-random function[14]. Note that (47) is a mere re-expression of (45) using a different notation. For any block $i = 1, \cdots, B_n$ and for any observation

[13] $\mathcal{U}_n$ is a Borel space, for example the space $\mathcal{C}_1[0, \Delta\tau_n]$ of 1-dimensional continuous paths parametrized by time $t \in [0, \tau_n]$.

[14] Let $\mathcal{C}_p(\mathbb{R}^+)$ be the space of p-dimensional continuous paths parametrized by time $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$, which is a Borel space. Consequently, $\mathcal{U}_n \times \mathcal{C}_p(\mathbb{R}^+)$ is also a Borel space. We assume that $F_n(x,y)$ is a jointly

time $j = 0, \cdots, h_n$ of the ith block, we define $\mathcal{I}_{i,n}^j$[15] the information up to time $\tau_{i,n}^j$. The crucial assumption is that $U_{i,n}^j$ has to be independent of the past information[16] (and in particular of $\tilde{\Theta}_{i,n}$). Note that we don't assume any independence between the random innovation $U_{i,n}^j$ and the parameter process $\{\theta_s^*\}_{\tau_{i,n}^{j-1} \leq s \leq \tau_{i,n}^j}$. We provide directly the definitions of F_n and $U_{i,n}^j$ in the two toy examples.

Example 3. (estimating volatility) In this case, $\mathcal{U}_n$ is defined as the space $\mathcal{C}_1[0, \Delta\tau_n]$ of continuous paths parametrized by time $t \in [0, \tau_n]$, $U_{i,n}^j := \{\Delta W_{[\tau_{i,n}^{j-1}, s]}\}_{\tau_{i,n}^{j-1} \leq s \leq \tau_{i,n}^j}$ are the Brownian motion increment path processes between two consecutive observation times. We assume that (W_t^θ, W_t) is jointly a (possibly non-standard) 2-dimensional Brownian motion. Thus, the random innovation $U_{i,n}^j$ are indeed independent of the past in view of the Markov property of Brownian motions. We also define $F_n(u_t, \theta_t) := \int_0^{\tau_n} \theta_s^{\frac{1}{2}} du_s$. We thus obtain that the returns are defined as $R_{i,n}^j := \int_{\tau_{i,n}^{j-1}}^{\tau_{i,n}^j} \sigma_s dW_s$ and that the approximated returns $\tilde{R}_{i,n}^j := \sigma_{\tau_{i,n}^0} \Delta W_{[\tau_{i,n}^{j-1}, \tau_{i,n}^j]}$ are the same quantity when holding the volatility constant on the block.

Example 4. (estimating the rate of a Poisson process) We assume that the rate of the (possibly inhomogeneous) Poisson process is $\alpha_n \lambda_t$, where α_n is a non time-varying and non-random quantity such that $\alpha_n \Delta\tau_n := 1$. In this case, we assume that $\mathcal{U}_n$ is the space of increasing paths on $\mathbb{R}^+$ starting from 0 which takes values in $\mathbb{N}$ and whose jumps are equal to 1. We also assume that for any path in $\mathcal{U}_n$, the number of jumps is finite on any compact of $\mathbb{R}^+$. $U_{i,n}^j$ can be defined as standard Poisson processes $\{N_t^{i,j,n}\}_{t \geq 0}$, independent of each other. We also have $F_n(u_t, \theta_t) := u_{\int_0^{\tau_n} \alpha_n \theta_s du_s}$. Thus, if

---

measurable real-valued function on $\mathcal{U}_n \times \mathcal{C}_p(\mathbb{R}^+)$. Note that the advised reader will have seen that a priori $\{\theta_s^*\}_{\tau_{i,n}^{j-1} \leq s \leq \tau_{i,n}^j}$ is defined on $\mathcal{C}_p[0, \tau_n]$ (after translation of the domain by $-\tau_{i,n}^{j-1}$) in (47) and $\tilde{\Theta}_{i,n}$ is a vector in (48), whereas both should be defined on the space $\mathcal{C}_p(\mathbb{R}^+)$ according to the definition. We match the definitions by extending them as continuous paths on $\mathbb{R}^+$. Formally, if $\theta_t \in \mathcal{C}_p[0, \tau_n]$, we extend it as $\theta_t := \theta_{\tau_n}$ for all $t > \tau_n$. Similarly, if $\theta \in K$, we extend it as $\theta_t := \theta$ for all $t \geq 0$.

[15] In this paper, we will be using the term *information* to refer to the mathematical object of *filtration*. Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$ be a probability space. Define the *sorted information* $\{\mathcal{I}_{k,n}\}_{k \geq 0}$ such that for any non-negative integer k that we can decompose as $k = (i-1)h_n + j$ where $i \in \{1, \cdots, B_n\}$ and $j \in \{0, \cdots, h_n\}$, $\mathcal{I}_{k,n} := \mathcal{I}_{i,n}^j$. We assume that $\mathcal{I}_{k,n}$ is a (discrete-time) filtration on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$. In addition, we assume that $\{\theta_s^*\}_{0 \leq s \leq \tau_{i,n}^j}$ and $U_{i,n}^j$ are $\mathcal{I}_{i,n}^j$-measurable.

[16] past information means up to time $\tau_{i,n}^{j-1}$

we let $t^j_{i,n} := \int_{\tau^{j-1}_{i,n}}^{\tau^j_{i,n}} \alpha_n \lambda_s ds$, the returns are the time-changed Poisson processes

$$R^j_{i,n} = N^{i,j,n}_{t^j_{i,n}}, \tag{49}$$

$$\tilde{R}^j_{i,n} = N_{\alpha_n \Delta \tau^j_{i,n} \lambda^{i,j,n}_{\tau^0_{i,n}}}. \tag{50}$$

9.2 Consistency

In the following of this section and Section 4, we will make the block size h_n go to infinity

$$h_n \to \infty. \tag{51}$$

Furthermore, we will make the block length $\Delta \mathrm{T}_{i,n}$ vanish asymptotically. Because we assumed observations are regular in this section, this can be expressed as

$$h_n n^{-1} \to 0. \tag{52}$$

We can rewrite the consistency of $\widehat{\Theta}_n$ as

$$\sum_{i=1}^{B_n} \big(\widehat{\Theta}_{i,n} - \Theta_{i,n}\big) \Delta \mathrm{T}_{i,n} \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0. \tag{53}$$

where the formal definition of $\widehat{\Theta}_{i,n}$ can be found in (57). In order to show (53), we can decompose the increments $(\widehat{\Theta}_{i,n} - \Theta_{i,n})$ into the part related to misspecified distribution error, the part on estimation of approximated returns error and the evolution in the spot parameter error

$$\widehat{\Theta}_{i,n} - \Theta_{i,n} = \big(\widehat{\Theta}_{i,n} - \widehat{\tilde{\Theta}}_{i,n}\big) + \big(\widehat{\tilde{\Theta}}_{i,n} - \tilde{\Theta}_{i,n}\big) + \big(\tilde{\Theta}_{i,n} - \Theta_{i,n}\big), \tag{54}$$

where $\widehat{\tilde{\Theta}}_{i,n}$, which is defined formally in (58), is the parametric estimator used on the underlying non-observed approximated returns. It is not a feasible estimator and appears in (54) only to shed light on the way we can obtain the consistency of the estimator in the proofs. We first deal with the last error term in (54), which is due to the non-constancy of the spot parameter θ^*_t. Note that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{B_n} \big(\tilde{\Theta}_{i,n} - \Theta_{i,n}\big) \Delta \mathrm{T}_{i,n} = \sum_{i=1}^{B_n} \big(\theta^*_{\mathrm{T}_{i-1,n}} \Delta \mathrm{T}_{i,n} - \int_{\mathrm{T}_{i-1,n}}^{\mathrm{T}_{i,n}} \theta^*_s ds\big) \tag{55}$$

and thus we deduce from Riemann-approximation[17] that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{B_n} \big(\tilde{\Theta}_{i,n} - \Theta_{i,n}\big)\Delta \mathrm{T}_{i,n} \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0. \tag{56}$$

To deal with the other terms in (54), we assume that for any positive integer k, the practitioner has at hand an estimator $\hat{\theta}_{k,n} := \hat{\theta}_{k,n}(r_{1,n}; \cdots ; r_{k,n})$, which depends on the input of returns $\{r_{1,n}; \cdots ; r_{k,n}\}$. On each block $i = 1, \cdots , B_n$ we estimate the local parameter as

$$\widehat{\Theta}_{i,n} := \hat{\theta}_{h_n,n}\big(R^1_{i,n}; \cdots ; R^{h_n}_{i,n}\big). \tag{57}$$

The non-feasible estimator $\widehat{\tilde{\Theta}}_{i,n}$ is defined as the same parametric estimator with approximated returns as input instead of observed returns

$$\widehat{\tilde{\Theta}}_{i,n} := \hat{\theta}_{h_n,n}\big(\tilde{R}^1_{i,n}; \cdots ; \tilde{R}^{h_n}_{i,n}\big). \tag{58}$$

Note that (58) is infeasible because the approximated returns $\tilde{R}^j_{i,n}$ are non-observable quantities.

Example 5. (estimating volatility) The estimator is the scaled usual RV, i.e. $\hat{\theta}_{k,n}(r_{1,n}; \cdots ; r_{k,n}) := T^{-1}k^{-1}n\sum_{j=1}^{k} r^2_{j,n}$. Note that $\hat{\theta}_{k,n}$ can also be asymptotically seen as the MLE (see the discussion pp. 112-115 in Mykland and Zhang (2012)).

Example 6. (estimating the rate of a Poisson process) The estimator to be used is the return mean $\hat{\theta}_{k,n}(r_{1,n}; \cdots ; r_{k,n}) := k^{-1}\sum_{j=1}^{k} r_{j,n}$.

For any $M > 0$, we introduce the following bounded space for the parameter value.

Definition. (K_M) For any $M > 0$, we define $K_M := \{\theta \in K : \ \mid \theta \mid \leq M \text{ and } \theta^+ \geq M^{-1}\}$, which is a bounded subset of K.

In order to tackle the second term in (54), we make the assumption that the parametric estimator is $\mathbf{L}^1$-convergent, locally uniformly in the model parameter θ if we actually observes returns coming from the parametric model. This can be expressed in the following condition.

[17] see i.e. Proposition 4.44 in p.51 of Jacod and Shiryaev (2003)

Condition (C1). Let the innovation of a block $(V_{1,n}, \cdots, V_{h_n,n})$ be IID with distribution U. For any $M > 0$,

$$\sup_{\theta \in K_M} \mathbb{E}\left[\left|\hat{\theta}_{h_n,n}(F_n(V_{1,n},\theta); \cdots; F_n(V_{h_n,n},\theta)) - \theta\right|\right] \to 0.$$

Remark 19. (practicability) Under Condition (C1), results on regular conditional distributions[18] give us that the error made on the estimation of the underlying non-observed returns tends to 0, i.e.

$$\sum_{i=1}^{B_n} \big(\widehat{\tilde{\Theta}}_{i,n} - \tilde{\Theta}_{i,n}\big)\Delta \mathrm{T}_{i,n} \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0. \tag{59}$$

This proof technique is the main idea of the paper. Regular conditional distributions are used to deduce results on the time-varying parameter model using uniform results in the parametric model. It considerably simplifies the work of the econometrician, in the sense that Condition (C1) is most likely easier to verify than (59). Indeed, Condition (C1) is "parametric" with non-random parameter, whereas (59) is "nonparametric" and each term of the sum $\tilde{\Theta}_{i,n}$ is a mixture of parameter. Moreover, the uniform convergence in Condition (C1) shouldn't be an additional problem at all once the econometrician has the (non-uniform) convergence because the parameter $\theta \in K_M$, which is a bounded space.

Remark 20. (consistency) Note that $\mathbf{L}^1$-convergence is slightly stronger than the simple consistency of the parametric estimator. Nonetheless, in most applications, we will have both.

To deal with the first term of (54), we need to make sure that we can control the discrepancy between the estimate made on the observed returns and the estimate made on the underlying approximated returns, uniformly in the initial parameter and in the future path of the parameter process. First, we need to introduce a new definition.

Definition. $(\mathcal{E}_{M,n})$ For any $M > 0$, we define $\mathcal{E}_{M,n}$ the product space of all null-drift continuous p-dimensional Itô-process and innovation (θ_t, V_n), where $V_n := (V_{1,n}, \cdots, V_{h_n,n})$, such that the initial value θ_0 is non-random, $\theta_t \in K_M$ for all $0 \leq t \leq T$, the volatility of θ_t is bounded by M for all $0 \leq t \leq T$, and for any $j = 1, \cdots, h_n$ we have $V_{j,n}$ independent of the path past $\{\theta_s\}_{0 \leq s \leq \tau_{1,n}^{j-1}}$.

[18] see for instance Leo Breiman (1992), see Appendix 12.2 for more details.

In analogy with K_M which is a bounded space for the parameter value, $\mathcal{E}_{M,n}$ can be seen as a bounded space for the parameter path (in the parameter value and the parameter volatility at each time $0 \leq t \leq T$). Note that each path in $\mathcal{E}_{M,n}$ is random (but with non-random starting value), whereas elements of K_M are non-random. We can now express the new following assumption.

Condition (C2). We have

$$\sup_{(\theta_t,V_n)\in\mathcal{E}_{M,n}} \mathbb{E}\Bigg[\Big|\hat{\theta}_{h_n,n}\big(F_n(V_{1,n},\theta_0),\cdots,F_n(V_{h_n,n},\theta_0)\big)$$

$$-\hat{\theta}_{h_n,n}\big(F_n(V_{1,n},\{\theta_s\}_{0\leq s\leq\tau^1_{1,n}}),\cdots,F_n(V_{h_n,n},\{\theta_s\}_{\tau^{h_n-1}_{1,n}\leq s\leq\tau^{h_n}_{1,n}})\big)\Big|\Bigg] \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0.$$

Remark 21. (practicability) Condition (C2) implies[19] that the error due to the local model approximation vanishes in the limit, i.e.

$$\sum_{i=1}^{B_n}(\widehat{\Theta}_{i,n}-\widehat{\widetilde{\Theta}}_{i,n})\Delta\mathrm{T}_{i,n} \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0. \tag{60}$$

Here again, the main argument of the proof is regular conditional distributions. In analogy with Remark 19, the econometrician is expected to have less trouble verifying Condition (C2) than (60). Indeed, the parameter has a non-random initial value (and a random path) in Condition (C2), but a mixture of initial value $\sigma^{\theta}_{\tau^0_{i-1,n}}$ (and a random path) in (60). Note that here again the uniformity in Condition (C2) is not expected to add any difficulty to the problem because we look at expected values and $\mathcal{E}_{M,n}$ is a well-chosen bounded space (in the parameter value and the parameter volatility).

We can now summarize the theorem on consistency in this very simple case where observations occur at equidistant time intervals and returns are IID under the parametric model.

Theorem (Consistency). *Under Condition (C1) and Condition (C2), we have the consistency of (8), i.e.*

$$\widehat{\Theta}_n \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} \Theta.$$

[19] see Appendix 12.2 for more details

We obtain the consistency in the couple of toy examples[20].

Remark 22. (adding a drift) In Example 1, by Girsanov theorem, together with local arguments (see, e.g., pp.158-161 in Mykland and Zhang (2012)), we can weaken the price and volatility local-martingale assumption by allowing them to follow an Itô-process (of dimension 2), with a volatility matrix locally bounded and locally bounded away from 0, and drift which is also locally bounded.

Remark 23. (LPE equal to the parametric estimator) The reader will have noticed that in the couple of examples, the LPE is equal to the parametric estimator. This is because in those very basic examples, the parametric estimator is linear, i.e. for any positive integer k and $l = 1, \cdots, k-1$

$$\hat{\theta}_{k,n}(r_{1,n}; \cdots; r_{k,n}) = \frac{l}{k}\hat{\theta}_{l,n}(r_{1,n}; \cdots; r_{l,n}) + \frac{k-l}{k}\hat{\theta}_{k-l,n}(r_{l+1,n}; \cdots; r_{k,n}) \tag{61}$$

In more general examples of Section 10, (61) will break, and we will obtain two distinct estimators.

9.3 Challenges

There are three empirical reasons why the presentation above is too simple. In practice, the observed returns can be *autocorrelated*, *noisy* and there can be *endogeneity* in sampling times. Accordingly, we will build the general LPM in Section 2. Also, we will investigate the limit distribution in Section 4.

10 Appendix II: other examples of models contained within the LPM

In this section, we want to document that assumptions of the LPM are widely satisfied by models of the literature used to estimate high-frequency quantities. In addition to models from the literature, we introduce in Section 10.2 a new model where efficient price follows a continuous local martingale and the correlation structure between efficient price, microstructure noise and arrival times is very general.

[20] see Appendix 12.3 for proofs

10.1 Volatility in the HBT model

The HBT model was introduced in Potiron and Mykland (2015) as a general multi-dimensional endogenous model which can possibly includes microstructure noise of a specific form. In this section, we consider the one-dimensional case and notation of pp. 7-8 in Potiron and Mykland (2015) are "in force". We define the observation time process $X_t^{(t)}$, the down process $d_{t,n}(s)$ (which takes negative values) and the up process $u_{t,n}(s)$ (which takes positive values). We also define the tick size α_n and assume that asymptotically $\alpha_n \to 0$. The observation times are defined as $\tau_{0,n} := 0$ and for any positive integer i

$$\tau_{i,n} := \inf\left\{t > \tau_{i-1,n} : \Delta X^{(t)}_{[\tau_{i-1,n},t]} \notin \left[\alpha_n d_{t,n}\left(t - \tau_{i-1,n}\right), \alpha_n u_{t,n}\left(t - \tau_{i-1,n}\right)\right]\right\}. \quad (62)$$

We assume that we observe $Z_{\tau_{i,n}} := X_{\tau_{i,n}} + \epsilon_{\tau_{i,n}}$, where $\epsilon_{\tau_{i,n}}$ corresponds to the microstructure noise. We also recall the definition of the two-dimensional process $Y_t := (X_t, X_t^{(t)})$, and assume that Y_t follows a null-drift Itô-process with (matrix) volatility σ_t^Y. We assume that $d_{t,n}$ and $u_{t,n}$ depend on a multidimensional parameter μ_t and that $\theta_t^* := (\sigma_t^Y(\sigma_t^Y)^T, \mu_t)$. We aim to express the HBT model as a LPM and propose in the following to have a look at μ_t and other LPM quantities one simple HBT example, the Hitting Constant Boundaries model.

In Example 1 in Potiron and Mykland (2015), we assume no noise in observations $\epsilon_{\tau_{i,n}} := 0$ and constant up and down processes $\left(u_{t,n}(s), d_{t,n}(s)\right) := \left(\theta_u, \theta_d\right) \in (\mathbb{R}_+^*, \mathbb{R}_-^*)$. We can define in that simple case $\mu_t := \left(\theta_u, \theta_d\right)$. Since $X_t := X_t^{(t)}$, the information contained in $\sigma_t^Y(\sigma_t^Y)^T$ can be expressed as the one-dimensional volatility σ_t^2 of X_t. Thus, we can define $\theta_t^* := (\sigma_t^2, \theta_u, \theta_d)$. With the technology of this paper, we can assume that θ_u and θ_d are continuous local martingale parameters in the model where arrival times are defined recursively as $\tau_{0,n} := 0$ and for any positive integer i via

$$\tau_{i,n} := \inf\left\{t > \tau_{i-1,n} : \Delta X_{[\tau_{i-1,n},s]} = \alpha_n \theta_{u,\tau_{i-1,n}} \text{ or } \Delta X_{[\tau_{i-1,n},s]} = \alpha_n \theta_{d,\tau_{i-1,n}}\right\}. \quad (63)$$

In (63), the boundaries are piece-wise constant equal to the initial parameter value. We can write (63) as a LPM with $M_{i,n} := R_{i,n} := (\Delta X_{\tau_{i,n}}, \Delta\tau_{i,n})$. In particular no unobserved quantity $Q_{i,n}$ are needed. Also, the order of memory is $m := 0$. The random innovation is defined as the future path of the Brownian motion $U_{i,n} := \left(\Delta W_{[\tau_{i-1,n},t]}\right)_{t \geq \tau_{i-1,n}}$

and since $m = 0$, the returns can be written as $R_{i,n} := F_n(U_{i,n}, \{\theta^*_s\}_{\tau_{i-1,n} \leq s \leq \tau_{i,n}})$. If we define

$$v := \inf\Big\{t > 0 : \int_0^t \sigma_s du_s = \alpha_n \theta_{u,0} \text{ or } \int_0^t \sigma_s du_s = \alpha_n \theta_{d,0}\Big\},$$

we can express $F_n\big(u_t, (\sigma_t^2, \theta_{u,t}, \theta_{d,t})\big) := \big(\int_0^v \sigma_s du_s, v\big)$. Thus, the Hitting Constant Boundaries model is contained within the LPM class.

10.2 Volatility in an extended noisy HBT model where noise can be auto-correlated and correlated with the efficient price

We go one step further the HBT model by allowing general microstructure noise in the model as well. We keep the structure generating the sampling times (62), but we observe now noisy returns

$$R_{i,n} := (\Delta X_{\tau_{i,n}} + \epsilon_{\tau_{i,n}} - \epsilon_{\tau_{i-1,n}}, \Delta\tau_{i,n}). \tag{64}$$

We also define the unobserved returns $Q_{i,n} := (\Delta X_{\tau_{i,n}}, \epsilon_{\tau_{i,n}})$ and we assume that there exists θ^*_t and $U_{i,n}$ such that (4) is satisfied for an order of memory m. Note that the assumption (4) together with the assumption (64) allow for a very general model. In particular, the noise and the efficient price can be correlated with each other with a more general form than in Kalnina and Linton (2008) and the noise auto-correlated. Also, the sampling times can be correlated with the efficient price, the volatility, the microstructure noise and any other quantities of interest in the model. In the simplest (non realistic) case, we can imagine that the noise follows the same assumption as in Section 6. Because observations occur on the tick grid, a realistic model assumes that the observed price $Z_{\tau_{i,n}} := X_{\tau_{i,n}} + \epsilon_{\tau_{i,n}}$ takes only modulo of the tick size values. One possible extension of the model introduced in Section 6 assumes that the price is rounded, i.e. $Z_{\tau_{i,n}} := (X_{\tau_{i,n}} + \epsilon_{\tau_{i,n}})^{(\alpha_n)}$. It can be expressed as a LPM of order $m = 1$ with

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{i,n} &:= (\epsilon_{\tau_{i,n}}, X_{\tau_{i,n}}), \\ R_{i,n} &:= \Delta X_{\tau_{i,n}} + \epsilon_{\tau_{i,n}} - \epsilon_{\tau_{i-1,n}}, \\ U_{i,n} &:= (\{\Delta W_{[\tau_{i-1,n},s]}\}_{\tau_{i-1,n} \leq s \leq \tau_{i,n}}, \gamma_{\tau_{i,n}}). \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, we can show that one other simple model, the floor rounding with probability $\frac{1}{2}$ and ceiling rounding with probability $\frac{1}{2}$ of the efficient price model, which is decribed in p.7 of Dahlaus and Neddermeyer (2014), is contained within the LPM class. We insist on the fact that those are basic examples and that the LPM class is much broader.

We conjecture here again that a local MLE would satisfy the conditions of Section 4, and that we could then infer in particular about the integrated volatalitity, observation times parameter and integrated microstructure noise.

10.3 High Frequency Regression and ANOVA

We are interested in systems of the form $dV_t = \beta_t dX_t + dZ_t$, where the high-frequency correlation between X_t and Z_t is null, i.e. $\langle X, Z \rangle_t = 0$, and we can observe the two processes V_t and X_t. Moreover, we assume that X_t can be multidimensional. We can see β_t as the beta from portfolio optimization and Z_t the idiosyncratic noise, or β_t can be the hedging delta of an option, with Z_t the error. There are two different objects of interest. First, the regression problem seeks to infer about the integrated beta (Mykland and Zhang (2009, Section 4.2, pp. 1424-1426), Kalnina (2012), Zhang (2012, Section 4, pp. 268-273), Reiß et al. (2014)). The ANOVA problem seeks to estimate $\langle Z, Z \rangle_T := \int_0^T (\sigma_s^Z)^2 ds$ (Zhang (2001) and Mykland and Zhang (2006)). We define $Y_t := (V_t, X_t)$ and assume that Y_t is a null-drift Itô-process with volatility σ_t^Y. We can define the multidimensional parameter $\theta_t^* := (\beta_t, \sigma_t^Y, (\sigma_t^Z)^2)$. We are interested in the estimation of the integrated sub-parameter $\xi_t^* := (\beta_t, (\sigma_t^Z)^2)$.

In the case where there is no microstructure noise in observations and the observations occur at regular times, it is easy to show that the LPM class contains the model and that the estimator to be used locally is the usual least squares estimator, together with the residual variance estimator. Furthermore, the assumptions of Section 4 are easily satisfied. In the more general case where there can be microstructure noise, we can use a model similar to Section 10.2. We conjecture in this case again that a local MLE (or possibly another estimator) would satisfy the conditions of Section 4.

10.4 Limit Order Book (LOB)

A LOB collects for any $t \geq 0$ the total volume of non-executed orders for any price level and any type. We can model a LOB as a multidimensional point process, where each component counts the number of orders of a given type and a given price level. Very often it is assumed in the literature that the point process is a function of a non time-varying parameter θ^* as in Ogihara and Yoshida (2011). This constancy assumption is seldom checked properly. Using the techniques of this paper, The LOB user could allow for a time-varying parameter. First, she would need to investigate if the LPM class contains her parametric model, build a time-varying parameter model and then check the conditions of Section 4 to use a LPE. We saw in Example 2 that a 1-dimensional Poisson-process is a LPM. Furthermore, Clinet and Potiron (2016) showed that we can build a time-varying parameter extension of the Hawkes process introduced in Hawkes (1971) and used in, for example, Bacry et al. (2013) and Aït-Sahalia et al. (2015), which is contained within the LPM class. Moreover, they showed how to bias-correct the MLE introduced in Clinet and Yoshida (2015), and provided the CLT of the associated LPE following very similar conditions of Section 4.

10.5 Leverage effect

The leverage effect describes the (usually) negative relation between stock returns and their volatility (see e.g. Wang and Mykland (2014), Aït-Sahalia et al. (2014)). In that case, the parameter of interest can be defined as $\xi_t^* := d\langle X, F(\sigma)\rangle_t/dt$ where conditions on the nonrandom function F can be found in p.199 of Wang and Mykland (2014). Note that the convergence rate is $l = \frac{1}{4}$ if there is no microstructure noise. In light of Condition (E4), this example would provide a new estimator with a convergence rate not as good as the parametric estimator. If we assume that the model is the same as in Section 10.2, a LPE could work but a parametric estimator would first need to be given.

10.6 Volatility of volatility

One would have to investigate first a parametric estimator in this problem too. The parameter of interest is defined as $\xi_t^* := d\langle \sigma^2, \sigma^2\rangle_t/dt$. The convergence rate is also

$l = \frac{1}{4}$. We can find results on this inference problem in Vetter (2011) and Mykland, Shephard and Sheppard (2012).

11 Appendix III: another example of theoretical application

Theoretical conditions provided in Section 4 can be satisfied for specific problems. Potiron and Mykland (2015) provided a bias-corrected HY estimator and used techniques similar to the ones provided in this paper to estimate the high-frequency covariance with asynchronous and endogenous observations in the HBT model. We provide insight into their work.

We generalize the definition of the HBT model in the two-dimensional case following Section 2 of Potiron and Mykland (2015). We also recall the definition of the four-dimensional process $Y_t := (X_t^{(1)}, X_t^{(2)}, X_t^{(t,1)}, X_t^{(t,2)})$ and assume that Y_t follows a null-drift Itô-process with volatility σ_t^Y. Finally, for $k = 1, 2$ we assume that $d_{t,n}^{(k)}$ and $u_{t,n}^{(k)}$ depend on a multidimensional parameter μ_t such that $\theta_t^* := (\sigma_t^Y(\sigma_t^Y)^T, \mu_t)$. The arrival times of the kth asset are defined as $\tau_{i,n}^{(k)} := 0$ and for any positive integer i

$$\tau_{i,n}^{(k)} := \inf\left\{t > \tau_{i-1,n}^{(k)} : \Delta X^{(t)}_{[\tau_{i-1,n}^{(k)},t]} \notin \left[\alpha_n d_{t,n}^{(k)}\left(t - \tau_{i-1,n}^{(k)}\right), \alpha_n u_{t,n}^{(k)}\left(t - \tau_{i-1,n}^{(k)}\right)\right]\right\}. \quad (65)$$

We are concerned with the estimation of the high-frequency covariance and thus $\xi_t^* := (\sigma_t^Y(\sigma_t^Y)^T)^{1,2}$. We are exactly in the setting of Remark 14 with $p' = 1$. We choose to work with the bias-corrected HY introduced in Section 4.2 of Potiron and Mykland (2015).

We first show that the two-dimensional HBT model is contained within the LPM class. For that purpose, we identify the local Markov chain quantities used in the proof of the cited work. Note that the authors assume that $d_{t,n}^{(k)}$ and $u_{t,n}^{(k)}$ don't depend on n in their asymptotic, but under adequate assumptions[21] which allow such dependence, the limit theory of their work still holds. Following the notation, we define the non-observed

[21] Investigating such assumptions is beyond the scope of this paper.

part as equal to

$$Q_{i,n} := \big(\Delta X^{(2)}_{[\tau^{1C,-}_{i-1,n},\tau^{1C}_{i-1,n}]}, \Delta X^{(t,2)}_{[\tau^{1C,-}_{i,n},\tau^{1C}_{i,n}]}\big)$$

and the observed-part as equal to

$$R_{i,n} := \big(\tau^{1C,+}_{i-1,n} - \tau^{1C}_{i-1,n}, \tau^{1C}_{i,n} - \tau^{1C,-}_{i,n}, \Delta X^{(1)}_{\tau^{1C}_{i,n}}, \Delta X^{(2)}_{\tau^{1C,-,+}_{i-1,n}}, \Delta\tau^{1C}_{i,n}\big).$$

We have that $m = 1$. We don't get more into details and choose not to express the expression of the functions F_n to be used.

We now point to the parts of the proof in Potiron and Mykland (2015) that can be used to verify the conditions in Section 4. Condition (E0) is straightforwardly satisfied by the assumptions of their work. Condition (E1) is satisfied by Lemma 7 in their work and Condition (E2) can be proven using the proof of Lemma 11. In Condition (E3), Equations (27) and (29) can be satisfied using the same techniques than in the first three steps in the proof of Lemma 14. Equation (28) is straightforward to show. We obtain Condition (E4) with $l = \frac{1}{2}$, $l' = \frac{1}{2}$ and $h_n = o(n^{\frac{1}{2}})$. Proof techniques of the first three steps in the proof of Lemma 14 can be used to prove (32) and (33) in Condition (E5). In Condition (E6), Equations (34) and (35) can be satisfied using a similar proof to the proof of Lemma 13.

We could add more general noise in the model extending the one-dimensional model introduced in Section 10.2. We conjecture that a local parametric (bias-corrected) MLE would satisfy the conditions of Section 4, and it would then be interesting to compare it to the pre-averaged Hayashi-Yoshida estimator of Christensen et al. (2010), Christensen et al. (2013) and Koike (2014), two scales covariance estimator in Zhang (2011), the multivariate realised kernel in Barndorff-Nielsen et al. (2011) and the high-frequency covariance estimator of Aït-Sahalia et al. (2010).

12 Appendix IV: proofs

12.1 Preliminaries

Since $\mid \theta^*_t \mid$ is locally bounded and $(\theta^*_t)^+$ is locally bounded away from 0, we can follow standard localisation arguments (see, e.g., pp. $160-161$ of Mykland and Zhang (2012))

and assume without loss of generality that there exists $M > 0$ such that $\theta_t^* \in K_M$ for all $0 \leq t \leq T$. Furthermore, because we assume that the volatility of the parameter σ_t^θ is locally bounded, we can use the same techniques and assume without loss of generality that there exists $\sigma^+ > 0$ such that $\sigma_t^\theta \leq \sigma^+$ for all $0 \leq t \leq T$.

Finally, we fix some notation. In the following of this paper, we will be using C for any constant $C > 0$, where the value can change from one line to the next.

12.2 Proof of Theorem (consistency)

Proof (C1) ⇒(59)

It suffices to show that (C1) implies that

$$\sup_{i \geq 0} \mathbb{E}\left[\left|\widehat{\tilde{\Theta}}_{i,n} - \tilde{\Theta}_{i,n}\right|\right] = o_p(1). \tag{66}$$

By (48) and (58), we can build g_n such that we can write

$$\left|\widehat{\tilde{\Theta}}_{i,n} - \tilde{\Theta}_{i,n}\right| = g_n(U_{i,n}^1, \cdots, U_{i,n}^{h_n}, \tilde{\Theta}_{i,n}),$$

where g_n is a jointly measurable real-valued function such that

$$\mathbb{E}\left|g_n(U_{i,n}^1, \cdots, U_{i,n}^{h_n}, \tilde{\Theta}_{i,n})\right| < \infty.$$

We have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\left[g_n(U_{i,n}^1, \cdots, U_{i,n}^{h_n}, \tilde{\Theta}_{i,n})\right] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}\left[g_n(U_{i,n}^1, \cdots, U_{i,n}^{h_n}, \tilde{\Theta}_{i,n})\middle|\tilde{\Theta}_{i,n}\right]\right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}\left[\int g_n(u, \tilde{\Theta}_{i,n})\mu_\omega(du)\right]
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mu_\omega(du)$ is a regular conditional distribution for $(U_{i,n}^1, \cdots, U_{i,n}^{h_n})$ given $\tilde{\Theta}_{i,n}$ (see, e.g., Breiman (1992)). From Condition (C1), we obtain (66).

Proof (C2) ⇒(60)

It is sufficient to show that $(C2)$ implies that

$$\sup_{i \geq 0} \mathbb{E}\left[\left|\hat{\Theta}_{i,n} - \hat{\tilde{\Theta}}_{i,n}\right|\right] = o_p(1). \tag{67}$$

By (47), (48), (57) and (58), we can build $g_n^{(2)}$ such that we can write

$$\left|\hat{\Theta}_{i,n} - \hat{\tilde{\Theta}}_{i,n}\right| = g_n^{(2)}(U_{i,n}^1, \cdots, U_{i,n}^{h_n}, \{\theta_s^*\}_{\tau_{i-1,n}^0 \leq s \leq \tau_{i,n}^0}, \tilde{\Theta}_{i,n}).$$

We compute

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\left[|\hat{\Theta}_{i,n} - \hat{\tilde{\Theta}}_{i,n}|\right] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}\left[g_n^{(2)}(U_{i,n}^1, \cdots, U_{i,n}^{h_n}, \{\theta_s^*\}_{\tau_{i-1,n}^0 \leq s \leq \tau_{i,n}^0}, \tilde{\Theta}_{i,n})|\tilde{\Theta}_{i,n}\right]\right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}\left[\int g_n^{(2)}(v, \tilde{\Theta}_{i,n})\mu_\omega(dv)\right] \\
&= o_p(1).
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mu_\omega(dv)$ is a regular conditional distribution for $(U_{i,n}^1, \cdots, U_{i,n}^{h_n}, \{\theta_s^*\}_{\tau_{i-1,n}^0 \leq s \leq \tau_{i,n}^0})$ given $\tilde{\Theta}_{i,n}$ and where we used Condition (C2) in the last equality.

12.3 Proof of Consistency in Example 1

Let's show Condition (C1) first. For any $M > 0$, the quantity

$$\left|\hat{\theta}_{h_n,n}\big(F_n(V_{1,n}, \theta); \cdots; F_n(V_{h_n,n}, \theta)\big) - \theta\right|$$

can be uniformly in $\{\theta \in K_M\}$ bounded by

$$C\Big|\sum_{j=1}^{h_n}(\Delta V_{[0;\tau_n],j,n})^2 T^{-1} - 1\Big|. \tag{68}$$

We can prove that (68) tends to 0 in probability as a straightforward consequence of Theorem $I.4.47$ of p.52 in Jacod and Shiryaev (2003).

To show Condition (C2), let $M > 0$. It is sufficient to show that the following quantity

$$nh_n^{-1}\sum_{j=1}^{h_n}\mathbb{E}\left[\Big|\big(\theta_0 \Delta V_{[0;\tau_n],j,n}\big)^2 - \big(\int_{\tau_{1,n}^{j-1}}^{\tau_{1,n}^j}\theta_s dV_{s-\tau_{1,n}^{j-1},j,n}\big)^2\Big|\right] \tag{69}$$

goes to 0 uniformly in $\{(\theta_t, V_n) \in \mathcal{E}_{M,n}\}$. Using Conditional Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality (BDG, see inequality (2.1.32) of p. 39 in Jacod and Protter (2012)), (69) can be bounded uniformly by

$$Ch_n^{-1}\sum_{j=1}^{h_n}\mathbb{E}\left[\Big|\theta_0 \Delta V_{[0;\tau_n],j,n} - \int_{\tau_{1,n}^{j-1}}^{\tau_{1,n}^j}\theta_s dV_{s-\tau_{1,n}^{j-1},j,n}\Big|\right]. \tag{70}$$

We can also bound uniformly (70) by

$$Ch_n^{-1}\sum_{j=1}^{h_n}\underbrace{(\Delta\tau_{1,n}^j)^{1/2}}_{O(n^{-1/2})}\underbrace{\mathbb{E}\left[\Big|\sup_{s\in[\tau_{1,n}^{j-1},\tau_{1,n}^j]}|\theta_0-\theta_s|\Big|\right]}_{o_p(n^{-1/2})}$$

where we used BDG another time to obtain $o_p(n^{-1/2})$.

12.4 Proof of Consistency in Example 2

Condition (C1) can be shown easily. Similarly, Condition (C2) is a direct consequence of the definition in (49), (50) together with (52).

12.5 Proof of Theorem (Central limit theorem)

We show (17)

We aim to show that

$$E_{i,n}:=\sum_{i=1}^{B_n}\underbrace{n^{\frac{1}{l}}\big(\tilde{\Theta}_{i,n}-\Theta_{i,n}\big)\Delta\mathrm{T}_{i,n}}_{e_{i,n}}\xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}}0. \tag{71}$$

Note that $\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{T}_{i-1,n}}\big[e_{i,n}\big]=0$ and thus that $E_{i,n}$ is a discrete martingale. We compute the limit of $n^{\frac{2}{l}}\sum_{i=1}^{B_n}\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{T}_{i-1,n}}\big[e_{i,n}^2\big]$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
n^{\frac{2}{l}}\sum_{i=1}^{B_n}\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{T}_{i-1,n}}\big[e_{i,n}^2\big] &= n^{\frac{2}{l}}\sum_{i=1}^{B_n}\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{T}_{i-1,n}}\Big[\big(\int_{\mathrm{T}_{i-1,n}}^{\mathrm{T}_{i,n}}(\theta_u^*-\theta_{\mathrm{T}_{i-1,n}}^*)du\big)^2\Big]\\
&\le Cn^{\frac{2}{l}}\sum_{i=1}^{B_n}\underbrace{\big(\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{T}_{i-1,n}}\big[(\Delta\mathrm{T}_{i,n})^4\big]\big)^{\frac{1}{2}}}_{O_p(h_n^2n^{-2})}\\
&\quad\underbrace{\Big(\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{T}_{i-1,n}}\big[\sup_{\mathrm{T}_{i-1,n}\le s\le\mathrm{T}_{i,n}}(\theta_s^*-\theta_{\mathrm{T}_{i-1,n}}^*)^4\big]\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}}}_{O_p(h_nn^{-1})}\\
&= o_p(1),
\end{aligned}$$

where we used Conditional Cauchy-Schwarz in the inequality, (22) of Condition $(E1)$ together with BDG inequality to obtain the big taus, and (30) in the last equality. Because we showed that $n^{\frac{2}{l}} \sum_{i=1}^{B_n} \mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{T}_{i-1,n}}\left[e_{i,n}^2\right]$ tends to 0 in probability, we obtain (71).

We show (19)

Without loss of generality, we can assume that the prameter θ_t^* is a 1-dimensional process. Because for example the parametric estimator can be biased, in all generality, $A_{i,n} := n^{\frac{1}{l}}\big(\hat{\tilde{\Theta}}_{i,n}^{\mathbf{M}_n^*} - \tilde{\Theta}_{i,n}\big)\Delta \mathrm{T}_{i,n}^{\mathbf{M}_n^*, \tilde{\Theta}_{i,n}}$ is not the increment term of a discrete martingale. Thus, we need first to compensate it in order to apply usual discrete martingale limit theorems. Let $B_{i,n} := A_{i,n} - \mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{T}_{i-1,n}}\left[A_{i,n}\right]$. We want to use Corollary 3.1 of pp. $58-59$ in Hall and Heyde (1980). First, note that by Condition (E0), condition (3.21) in p.58 of Hall and Heyde (1980) is satisfied. We turn now to the two other conditions of the corollary in the two following steps.

First condition : We will show in this step that for all $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{B_n} \mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{T}_{i-1,n}}\left[B_{i,n}^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{B_{i,n}>\epsilon\}}\right] \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0. \tag{72}$$

The conditional Cauchy-Schwarz inequality gives us that each term of the sum in (72) can be bounded by

$$\left(\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{T}_{i-1,n}}\left[B_{i,n}^4\right]\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{T}_{i-1,n}}\left[\mathbf{1}_{\{B_{i,n}>\epsilon\}}\right]\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{73}$$

To show that the right term of the sum in the right-hand side of (73) vanishes uniformly, we use regular conditional distribution together with (22), (27) and (30). We apply regular conditional distribution together with (28) on the left term of the sum in the right-hand side of (73). Then, we use the block assumption (31) when taking the sum of all the terms in the right-hand side of (73) and we can prove (72).

Second condition : We will prove that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{B_n} \mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{T}_{i-1,n}}\left[B_{i,n}^2\right] \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} T\int_0^T V_{\theta_s^*} ds. \tag{74}$$

By regular conditional distribution and (27), we have that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{B_n} \mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{T}_{i-1,n}}\big[B_{i,n}^2\big] \;=\; h_n^{1-\frac{2}{l'}} n^{\frac{2}{l}-1} T \sum_{i=1}^{B_n} \mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{T}_{i-1,n}}\big[V_{\theta^*_{\mathrm{T}_{i-1,n}}} \Delta \mathrm{T}_{i,n}^{\mathbf{M}_n^*,\tilde{\Theta}_{i,n}}\big] + o_p(1).$$

In view of (24), the conditional Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the boundedness of V_θ, we get

$$h_n^{1-\frac{2}{l'}} n^{\frac{2}{l}-1} \sum_{i=1}^{B_n} \mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{T}_{i-1,n}}\left[V_{\theta^*_{\mathrm{T}_{i-1,n}}} \Delta \mathrm{T}_{i,n}^{\mathbf{M}_n^*,\tilde{\Theta}_{i,n}}\right] = h_n^{1-\frac{2}{l'}} n^{\frac{2}{l}-1} \sum_{i=1}^{B_n} \mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{T}_{i-1,n}}\left[V_{\theta^*_{\mathrm{T}_{i-1,n}}} \Delta \mathrm{T}_{i,n}\right] + o_p(1).$$

Using Lemma 2.2.11 of Jacod and Protter (2012) together with conditional Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, (22) and the boundedness of V_θ, we obtain

$$h_n^{1-\frac{2}{l'}} n^{\frac{2}{l}-1} T \sum_{i=1}^{B_n} \mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{T}_{i-1,n}}\left[V_{\theta^*_{\mathrm{T}_{i-1,n}}} \Delta \mathrm{T}_{i,n}\right] = h_n^{1-\frac{2}{l'}} n^{\frac{2}{l}-1} T \sum_{i=1}^{B_n} V_{\theta^*_{\mathrm{T}_{i-1,n}}} \Delta \mathrm{T}_{i,n} + o_p(1).$$

We can apply now Proposition I.4.44 (p. 51) in Jacod and Shiryaev (2003) and (31) and we get

$$h_n^{1-\frac{2}{l'}} n^{\frac{2}{l}-1} T \sum_{i=1}^{B_n} V_{\theta^*_{\mathrm{T}_{i-1,n}}} \Delta \mathrm{T}_{i,n} \;\xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}}\; T \int_0^T V_{\theta^*_s} ds.$$

We are interested in the stable convergence of the sum of $A_{i,n}$ terms, but by using Corollary 3.1 of pp. $58-59$ in Hall and Heyde (1980), we only obtain the stable convergence of the increment martingale terms $B_{i,n}$. We will show now that the sum of the conditional means $S_n := \sum_{i=1}^{B_n} \mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{T}_{i-1,n}}\big[A_{i,n}\big]$ tends to 0 in probability. An application of (29) together with regular conditional distribution will give us the convergence to 0 of S_n.

We show (18)

We want to prove

$$n^{\frac{1}{l}} \sum_{i=1}^{B_n} \tilde{\Theta}_{i,n}\big(\Delta \mathrm{T}_{i,n}^{\mathbf{M}_n^*,\tilde{\Theta}_{i,n}} - \Delta \mathrm{T}_{i,n}\big) \;\xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}}\; 0. \tag{75}$$

We define the conditional expectation of the terms in the sum of (75)

$$C_{i,n} := \mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{T}_{i-1,n}}\Big[\tilde{\Theta}_{i,n}\big(\Delta \mathrm{T}_{i,n}^{\mathbf{M}_n^*,\tilde{\Theta}_{i,n}} - \Delta \mathrm{T}_{i,n}\big)\Big].$$

In analogy with the previous part, we can rewrite the term on the left-hand side of (75) as

$$n^{\frac{1}{l}}\big(\sum_{i=1}^{B_n} \underbrace{\tilde{\Theta}_{i,n}\big(\Delta \mathrm{T}_{i,n}^{\mathbf{M}_n^*,\tilde{\Theta}_{i,n}} - \Delta \mathrm{T}_{i,n}\big) - C_{i,n}}_{D_{i,n}} + \sum_{i=1}^{B_n} C_{i,n}\big).$$

Note that $\sum_{i=1}^{k} D_{i,n}$ is a discrete martingale, and thus to show that it vanishes asymptotically, it is sufficient to show

$$n^{\frac{2}{l}} \sum_{i=1}^{B_n} \mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{T}_{i-1,n}}\big[D_{i,n}^2\big] \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0. \tag{76}$$

Regular conditional distribution and (24) implies (76). Similarly, regular conditional distribution together with (23) enables us to deduce $\sum_{i=1}^{B_n} C_{i,n} \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0$. Thus, we proved (75).

We show (20) and (21)

The proof is very similar to the previous part, using respectively Condition (E5) and Condition (E6) instead of Condition (E2).

12.6 Proof of Theorem (Time-varying friction parameter model with uncertainty zones)

We verify Condition (E0) - Condition (E6) introduced in Section 4. We choose $\mathbf{M}_n^* = (1, 1, 1)$.

Condition (E0) : The continuous information can be defined in this problem such that $X_t, \theta_t^*, \sigma_t^\theta, W_t, W_t'$ are adapted to $\mathcal{J}_t^{(c)}$.

Condition (E1) : This follows exactly from Corollary 4.4 of p.14 in Robert and Rosenbaum (2012).

Condition (E2) : We can decompose $\Delta \mathrm{T}_{i,n}^{\mathbf{M},\theta_0} - \Delta \mathrm{T}_{i,n}^{\mathbf{N},\theta_t}$ into

$$\big(\Delta \mathrm{T}_{i,n}^{\mathbf{M},\theta_0} - \Delta \mathrm{T}_{i,n}^{\mathbf{N},\theta_0}\big) + \big(\Delta \mathrm{T}_{i,n}^{\mathbf{N},\theta_0} - \Delta \mathrm{T}_{i,n}^{\mathbf{N},\theta_t}\big). \tag{77}$$

We deal with the first term in (77). We can see that under the parametric model $\big(L_{i,n}, \text{sign}(R_{i,n}^{(1)})\big)$ follows a discrete Markov chain on the space $\{1, \cdots, m\} \times \{-1, 1\}$. Following the same line of reasoning as in the proof of Lemma 14 in Potiron and Mykland (2015), we can easily show that

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{(\theta_t,V,\mathbf{M},\mathbf{N})\in\mathcal{E}_{M,n}\times\mathcal{M}_{m,n}^2}\left|\mathbb{E}\big[\Delta \mathrm{T}_{i,n}^{\mathbf{M},\theta_0} - \Delta \mathrm{T}_{i,n}^{\mathbf{N},\theta_0}\big]\right| &= o_p(h_n n^{-1-\frac{1}{l}}),\\ \sup_{(\theta_t,V,\mathbf{M},\mathbf{N})\in\mathcal{E}_{M,n}\times\mathcal{M}_{m,n}^2}\text{Var}\left[\Delta \mathrm{T}_{i,n}^{\mathbf{M},\theta_0} - \Delta \mathrm{T}_{i,n}^{\mathbf{N},\theta_0}\right] &= o_p(h_n n^{-1-\frac{2}{l}}).\end{aligned}$$

We turn now to the second term in (77). Using the same idea as in the proof of Lemma 11 in Potiron and Mykland (2015), we deduce

$$\sup_{(\theta_t,V,\mathbf{N})\in\mathcal{E}_{M,n}\times\mathcal{M}_{m,n}}\left|\mathbb{E}\big[\Delta \mathrm{T}_{i,n}^{\mathbf{N},\theta_0} - \Delta \mathrm{T}_{i,n}^{\mathbf{N},\theta_t}\big]\right| = o_p(h_n n^{-1-\frac{1}{l}}), \tag{78}$$

$$\sup_{(\theta_t,V,\mathbf{N})\in\mathcal{E}_{M,n}\times\mathcal{M}_{m,n}}\text{Var}\left[\Delta \mathrm{T}_{i,n}^{\mathbf{M},\theta_0} - \Delta \mathrm{T}_{i,n}^{\mathbf{N},\theta_t}\right] = o_p(h_n n^{-1-\frac{2}{l}}). \tag{79}$$

Condition (E3) : We choose $l' = 2$. Let $M > 0$. Because in the model with uncertainty zones $\Delta \mathrm{T}_{i,n}^{\mathbf{M}_n^*,\theta}$ can be written as a sum of Markov chain $\big(L_{i,n}, \text{sign}(R_{i,n}^{(1)})\big)$ with a finite fourth moment, we have uniformly in $\theta \in K_M$ and in $i = 1, \cdots, B_n$ that

$$\begin{aligned}&\text{Var}\left[h_n^{\frac{1}{l'}}\left(\hat{\theta}_{h_n,n}(R_{i,n}^{1,\mathbf{M}_n^*,\theta};\cdots;R_{i,n}^{h_n,\mathbf{M}_n^*,\theta};\mathbf{R}_n^*) - \theta\right)\Delta \mathrm{T}_{i,n}^{\mathbf{M}_n^*,\theta}\right]\\ =\ &\text{Var}\left[h_n^{\frac{1}{l'}}\left(\hat{\theta}_{h_n,n}(R_{i,n}^{1,\mathbf{M}_n^*,\theta};\cdots;R_{i,n}^{h_n,\mathbf{M}_n^*,\theta};\mathbf{R}_n^*) - \theta\right)\right]\left(\mathbb{E}\big[\Delta \mathrm{T}_{i,n}^{\mathbf{M}_n^*,\theta}\big]\right)^2 + o_p(h_n^2 n^{-2})\\ =\ &\text{Var}\left[h_n^{\frac{1}{l'}}\left(\hat{\theta}_{h_n,n}(R_{i,n}^{1,\mathbf{M}_n^*,\theta};\cdots;R_{i,n}^{h_n,\mathbf{M}_n^*,\theta};\mathbf{R}_n^*) - \theta\right)\right]\mathbb{E}\big[\Delta \mathrm{T}_{i,n}^{\mathbf{M}_n^*,\theta}\big]\Delta \mathrm{T}_{i,n}^{\mathbf{M}_n^*,\theta} + o_p(h_n^2 n^{-2})\\ =\ &S_{\theta,n}^{(1)} S_{\theta,n}^{(2)} \Delta \mathrm{T}_{i,n}^{\mathbf{M}_n^*,\theta} T h_n n^{-1} + o_p(h_n^2 n^{-2}).\end{aligned}$$

with

$$S_{\theta,n}^{(1)} := \text{Var}\left[h_n^{\frac{1}{l'}}\left(\hat{\theta}_{h_n,n}(R_{i,n}^{1,\mathbf{M}_n^*,\theta};\cdots;R_{i,n}^{h_n,\mathbf{M}_n^*,\theta};\mathbf{R}_n^*) - \theta\right)\right]$$

and $S_{\theta,n}^{(2)} := \mathbb{E}\big[\Delta \mathrm{T}_{i,n}^{\mathbf{M}_n^*,\theta}\big] T^{-1} h_n^{-1} n$. By Lemma 4.19 in p.26 of Robert and Rosenbaum (2012) in the special case where the volatility is constant, we obtain the existence and the value of $S_\theta^{(1)}$ such that $S_{\theta,n}^{(1)} \to S_\theta^{(1)}$. Also, by Corollary 4.4 in p.14 of Robert and Rosenbaum (2012), there exists $S_\theta^{(2)}$ such that $S_{\theta,n}^{(2)} \to S_\theta^{(2)}$. If we define $V_\theta = S_\theta^{(1)} S_\theta^{(2)}$, (27) is satisfied. Moreover, (28) and (29) can be verified easily.

Condition (E4) : We choose $l = 2$, $l' = 2$ and h_n which satisfies (30).

Condition (E5) : This can be proven the same way as the first term in (77).

Condition (E6) : We can prove it using (78), (79) and similar arguments to the proof of Lemma 13 in Potiron and Mykland (2015).

12.7 Estimation of the friction parameter bias and standard deviation in the model with uncertainty zones

The notation of Section 7 and Section 7.2 are *in force*. We define $\hat{s}_n(\eta) := \hat{V}$, where an expression of $\hat{V}$ will be provided at the end of this section. First, we assume that the absolute jump size is constant equal to the tick size, i.e. $L_{i,n} := 1$. In view of (42), we have

$$\hat{\eta}_{\alpha,t}^{(m)} := \min\Big(1, \frac{N_{\alpha,t,1}^{(c)}}{2N_{\alpha,t,1}^{(a)}}\Big).$$

We also have by definition that the number of alternations is $N_{\alpha,t,1}^{(a)} = N_n - N_{\alpha,t,1}^{(c)}$. If we assume that N_n is non-random, then

$$N_{\alpha,t,1}^{(c)} \sim Bin(N_n, \frac{2\eta}{2\eta+1}), \tag{80}$$

where $Bin(n,p)$ is a binomial distribution with n observations and probability p. Let $B \sim Bin(N_n, \frac{2\eta}{2\eta+1})$. We can define the bias

$$B := \mathbb{E}\left[\min\Big(1, \frac{B}{2(N_n - B)}\Big)\right] - \eta$$

and the variance as

$$V := \mathrm{Var}\left[\min\Big(1, \frac{B}{2(N_n - B)}\Big)\right].$$

B and V can be computed easily numerically.

If N_n is random, we can work conditional on N_n. As the sampling times are endogenous, (80) is not true in that case. Nonetheless, we can still approximate $N_{\alpha,t,1}^{(c)}$ by $Bin(N_n, \frac{2\eta}{2\eta+1})$ if the number of observations is large enough.

We now turn out to the general case, where $L_{i,n}$ can be different from 1. For $k = 1, \cdots, m$ we define $p_k := \frac{2\eta+k-1}{2\eta+k}$ and we let B_k be an independent sequence of

distribution $Bin(N^{(c)}_{\alpha,t,k} + N^{(a)}_{\alpha,t,k}, p_k)$, and

$$C_k := \max\Big(0, \min\Big(1, \frac{1}{2}\big(k\big(\frac{B_k}{N^{(a)}_{\alpha,t,k} + N^{(c)}_{\alpha,t,k} - B_k} - 1\big) + 1\big)\Big)\Big).$$

The distribution of $\hat{\eta}^{(m)}_{\alpha,t}$ can be approximated by the distribution of $\sum_{i=1}^{m} \lambda^{(m)}_{\alpha,t,k} C_k$, and we can estimate the bias as $\hat{B} := \sum_{i=1}^{m} \lambda^{(m)}_{\alpha,t,i} \mathbb{E}\big[C_k\big]$ and the variance as $\hat{V} := \sum_{i=1}^{m} (\lambda^{(m)}_{\alpha,t,i})^2 \operatorname{Var}\big[C_k\big]$.

References

[1] Aït-Sahalia, Y., J. Cacho-Diaz and R.J.A. Laeven (2015). Modeling financial contagion using mutually exciting jump processes. *Journal of Financial Economics* 117(3), 585-606.

[2] Aït-Sahalia, Y., J. Fan, C.D. Wang and X. Yang (2014). *The Estimation of continuous and discontinuous leverage effect*, Available at SSRN.

[3] Aït-Sahalia, Y., J. Fan and D. Xiu (2010). High-frequency covariance estimates with noisy and asynchronous financial data, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 105, 1504-1517.

[4] Aït-Sahalia, Y., P.A. Mykland and L. Zhang (2005). How often to sample a continuous-time process in the presence of market microstructure noise, *Review of Financial Studies* 18, 351-416.

[5] Bacry, E., S. Delattre, M. Hoffmann, and J.-F. Muzy. Modelling microstructure noise with mutually exciting point processes. *Quantitative Finance* 13(1), 65-77.

[6] Barndorff-Nielsen, O.E., P.R. Hansen, A. Lunde and N. Shephard (2011). Multivariate realised kernels: consistent positive semi-definite estimators of the covariation of equity prices with noise and non-synchronous trading, *Journal of Econometrics* 162, 149-169.

[7] Berk, R. H. (1966). Limiting Behavior of Posterior Distributions When the Model Is Incorrect, *Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 37, 51-58.

[8] Berk, R. H. (1970). Consistency a Posteriori, *Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 41, 894-906.

[9] Chen, R. and P.A. Mykland (2015). *Discerning Non-Stationary Market Microstructure Noise and Time-Varying Liquidity in High Frequency Data*. Available at SSRN: http://ssrn.com/abstract=2699927 or http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2699927

[10] Christensen, K., S. Kinnebrock and M. Podolskij (2010). Pre-averaging estimators of the ex-post covariance matrix in noisy diffusion models with non-synchronous data, *Journal of Econometrics* 159, 116-133.

[11] Christensen, K., M. Podolskij and M. Vetter (2013). On covariation estimation for multivariate continuous Itô semimartingales with noise in non-synchronous observation schemes, *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 120, 59-84.

[12] Clinet, S. and Y. Potiron (2016). *Estimating the Integrated Parameter of the Time-Varying Parameter Self-Exciting Process*. arXiv preprint arXiv:1607.05831.

[13] Clinet, S. and N. Yoshida (2015). *Statistical Inference for Ergodic Point Processes and Limit Order Book*. arXiv preprint arXiv:1512.01899.

[14] Comte, F. and E. Renault (1998). Long memory in continuous-time stochastic volatility models, *Mathematical Finance* 8, 291-323.

[15] Cordeiro G. M., and R. Klein (1994). Bias correction in ARMA models. *Statistics & Probability Letters* 19, 3, 169-176.

[16] Dahlhaus, R. (1997). Fitting time series models to nonstationary processes, *The Annals of Statistics* 25(1), 1-37.

[17] Dahlhaus, R. (2000). A likelihood approximation for locally stationary processes, *The Annals of Statistics*, 1762-1794.

[18] Dahlhaus, R. and S.S. Rao (2006). Statistical inference for time-varying ARCH processes, *The Annals of Statistics* 34(3), 1075-1114.

[19] Dahlhaus, R. and J.C. Neddermeyer (2014). Online Spot Volatility-Estimation and Decomposition with Nonlinear Market Microstructure Noise Models, *Journal of Financial Econometrics* 12(1), 174-212.

[20] Fan, J. and I. Gijbels (1996). *Local polynomial modelling and its applications: monographs on statistics and applied probability 66*. Vol. 66. CRC Press.

[21] Fan, J. and W. Zhang (1999). Statistical estimation in varying coefficient models. *Annals of Statistics*, 1491-1518.

[22] Firth, D. (1993). Bias reduction of maximum likelihood estimates. *Biometrika* 80 (1), 27-38.

[23] Fisher, R.A. (1922). On the Mathematical Foundations of Theoretical Statistics. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London*, Series A, 222, 309-368.

[24] Fisher, R.A. (1925). Theory of Statistical Estimation. *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, 22, 700-725.

[25] Foster, D. and D. Nelson (1996). Continuous record asymptotics for rolling sample variance estimators, *Econometrica* 64, 139-174.

[26] Fukasawa, M. (2010). Realized volatility with stochastic sampling. *Stochastic Processes and Their Applications* 120, 829-552.

[27] Gloter, A. and J. Jacod (2001). Diffusions with measurement errors. I. Local asymptotic normality. *ESAIM: Probability and Statistics* 5, 225-242.

[28] Hall, P. and C.C. Heyde (1980). *Martingale Limit Theory and its Application.* Academic Press, Boston.

[29] Hansen, P.R. and A. Lunde (2006). Realized Variance and Market Microstructure Noise, *Journal of Business and Economic Statistics*

[30] Hastie T. and R. Tibshirani (1993). Varying-coefficient models. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society.* Series B (Methodological), 757-796.

[31] Hawkes, A. G. (1971). Point spectra of some mutually exciting point processes. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society.* Series B (Methodological), 438-443.

[32] Hayashi, T. and N. Yoshida (2005). On covariance estimation of non-synchronously observed diffusion processes. *Bernoulli* 11, 359-379.

[33] Hayashi, T. and N. Yoshida (2011). Nonsynchronous covariation process and limit theorems. *Stochastic Processes and Applications* 121, 2416-2454.

[34] Huber, P. J. (1967). The Behavior of Maximum Likelihood Estimates Under Non-standard Conditions. *Proceedings of the Fifth Berkeley Symposiumin Mathematical Statistics and Probability.* Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 221-233.

[35] Gloter, A. and Jacod, J. (2001). Diffusions with measurement errors. I. Local asymptotic normality. *ESAIM: Probability and Statistics*, 5, 225-242.

[36] Jacod, J. and P. Protter (1998). Asymptotic error distributions for the Euler method for stochastic differential equations. *Annals of Probability* 26, 267-307.

[37] Jacod, J. and P. Protter (2012). *Discretization of Processes.* Springer.

[38] Jacod, J. and M. Rosenbaum (2013). Quarticity and other functionals of volatility: efficient estimation. *The Annals of Statistics* 41.3, 1462-1484.

[39] Jacod, J. and A. Shiryaev (2003). *Limit Theorems For Stochastic Processes* (2nd ed.). Berlin: Springer-Verlag.

[40] Kalnina, I. and O. Linton (2008). Estimating quadratic variation consistently in the presence of endogenous and diurnal measurement error. *Journal of Econometrics* 147(1), 47-59.

[41] Kalnina, I. (2012). *Nonparametric tests of time variation in betas.* Technical report, University of Montreal, 2012.

[42] Kim, C. J. and Nelson, C. R. (2006). Estimation of a forward-looking monetary policy rule: A time-varying parameter model using ex post data. *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 53(8), 1949-1966.

[43] Koike, Y. (2014). Limit theorems for the pre-averaged Hayashi-Yoshida estimator with random sampling. *Stochastic Processes and Applications* 124 (8), 2699-2753.

[44] Li, Y., P.A. Mykland, E. Renault, L. Zhang and X. Zheng (2014). Realized volatility when sampling times are possibly endogenous. *Econometric Theory* 30, 580-605.

[45] McCullagh, P. and J.A. Nelder (1989). *Generalized linear models*. London: Chapman & Hall.

[46] Mykland, P.A., N. Shephard and K. Sheppard (2012). *Efficient and feasible inference for the components of financial variation using blocked multipower variation*. Technical Report, University of Oxford.

[47] Mykland, P.A., and L. Zhang (2006). ANOVA for Diffusions and Itô Processes. *Annals of Statistics* 34, 1931-1963.

[48] Mykland, P.A. and L. Zhang (2008). Inference for Volatility Type Objects and Implications for Hedging, *Statistics and its Interface* 1, 255-278.

[49] Mykland, P.A. and L. Zhang (2009). Inference for Continuous Semimartingales Observed at High Frequency. *Econometrica* 77, 1403-1445.

[50] Mykland, P.A. and L. Zhang (2011). The Double Gaussian Approximation for High Frequency Data. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics* 38, 215-236.

[51] Mykland, P.A. and L. Zhang (2012). The econometrics of High Frequency Data. In M. Kessler, A. Lindner and M. Sørensen (eds.), *Statistical Methods for Stochastic Differential Equations*, pp. 109-190. Chapman nad Hall/CRC Press.

[52] Mykland, P.A. and L. Zhang (2014). Assessment of Uncertainty in High Frequency Data: The Observed Asymptotic Variance. Available at SSRN 2475620.

[53] Ogihara, T. and N. Yoshida (2011). Quasi-likelihood analysis for the stochastic differential equation with jumps. *Statistical Inference for Stochastic Processes* 14 (3), 189-229.

[54] Potiron, Y. and P.A. Mykland (2015). *Estimation of integrated quadratic covariation between two assets with endogenous sampling times*. arXiv preprint arXiv:1507.01033.

[55] Reiß, M (2011). Asymptotic equivalence for inference on the volatility from noisy observations. *The Annals of Statistics* 39(2), 772-802.

[56] Reiß, M., V. Todorov and G. Tauchen (2014). Nonparametric test for a constant beta over a Fixed Time Interval.

[57] Robert, C.Y. and M. Rosenbaum (2011). A new approach for the dynamics of ultra-high-frequency data: the model with uncertainty zones. *Journal of Financial Econometrics* 9, 344-366.

[58] Robert, C.Y. and M. Rosenbaum (2012). Volatility and covariation estimation when microstructure noise and trading times are endogenous. *Mathematical Finance* 22 (1), 133-164.

[59] Stock, J. H. and M. W. Watson (1998). Median unbiased estimation of coefficient variance in a time-varying parameter model. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 93(441), 349-358.

[60] Tanaka K. (1984). An asymptotic expansion associated with the maximum likelihood estimators in ARMA models. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)*: 58-67.

[61] Vetter, M. (2011). *Estimation of Integrated Volatility of Volatility with Applications to Goodness-of-fit Testing*. Discussion paper.

[62] Wang, C.D. and P.A. Mykland (2014). The Estimation of Leverage Effect with High Frequency Data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 109, 197-215.

[63] White, H. (1982). Maximum Likelihood Estimation of Misspecified Models. *Econometrica* 50, 1-25.

[64] Xiu, D. (2010). Quasi-maximum likelihood estimation of volatility with high frequency data. *Journal of Econometrics* 159, 235-250

[65] Zhang, L. (2001). From Martingales to ANOVA : Implied and Realized Volatility. Ph.D. Thesis, The University of Chicago, Department of Statistics.

[66] Zhang, L. (2011). Estimation covariation: Epps effect, microstructure noise. *Journal of Econometrics* 160, 33-47.

[67] Zhang, L. (2012). Implied and realized volatility: Empirical model selection. *Annals of Finance*, 8, 259-275.



Figure 1: Evolution of $\hat{\eta}_{i,n}$ for different values of h_n. The red line corresponds to $\hat{\eta}^{(m)}_{\alpha_n,T}$. The blue lines are one standard deviation $\hat{s}_{h_n}$ away from $\hat{\eta}^{(m)}_{\alpha_n,T}$. The purple lines are two standard deviations away from $\hat{\eta}^{(m)}_{\alpha_n,T}$.



Figure 2: Estimated volatility $\hat{\sigma}_n$ for different values of h_n. The red line corresponds to the RV estimator. The blue line stands for the model with uncertainty zones volatility estimator $\widehat{RV}_{\alpha_n,T}$.

parameter		$\nu^{(\beta)}$	$\nu^{(\beta)}$	$\nu^{(\kappa)}$	$\nu^{(\kappa)}$
estimator	block size h_n	sample bias	s.d.	sample bias	s.d.
$\widehat{\Theta}_n^{(MLE)}$		-.0052	.0085	.1041	.0148
$\widehat{\Theta}_n^{(500)}$		.2913	.0355	.1666	.0355
$\widehat{\Theta}_n$	25	-.0168	.0131	-.0985	.0096
$\widehat{\Theta}_n^{(BC)}$	25	-.0172	.0132	-.0062	.0097
$\widehat{\Theta}_n$	100	.0035	.0083	-.0256	.0096
$\widehat{\Theta}_n^{(BC)}$	100	-.0010	.0082	-.0065	.0096
$\widehat{\Theta}_n$	500	-.0021	.0094	.0073	.0101
$\widehat{\Theta}_n^{(BC)}$	500	-.0049	.0095	.0098	.0104
$\widehat{\Theta}_n$	1000	-.0030	.0099	.0425	.0125
$\widehat{\Theta}_n^{(BC)}$	1000	-.0056	.0100	.0438	.0126
$\widehat{\Theta}_n$	2000	-.0032	.0102	.1029	.0143
$\widehat{\Theta}_n^{(BC)}$	2000	-.0055	.0101	.1035	.0143
$\widehat{\Theta}_n$	5000	-.0052	.0087	.1037	.0148
$\widehat{\Theta}_n^{(BC)}$	5000	-.0060	.0087	.1044	.0147

Table 1: In this table, we report the sample bias and the standard deviation for the different estimators in the case of a small number of oscillations $\delta = (4, 4)$.

parameter		$\nu^{(\beta)}$	$\nu^{(\beta)}$	$\nu^{(\kappa)}$	$\nu^{(\kappa)}$
estimator	block size h_n	sample bias	s.d.	sample bias	s.d.
$\widehat{\Theta}_n^{(MLE)}$		-.0069	.0105	.1094	.0222
$\widehat{\Theta}_n^{(500)}$		.0065	.0391	.0882	.0678
$\widehat{\Theta}_n$	25	-.0148	.0183	-.0876	.0144
$\widehat{\Theta}_n^{(BC)}$	25	-.0155	.0184	.0046	.0143
$\widehat{\Theta}_n$	100	.0017	.0092	-.0164	.0183
$\widehat{\Theta}_n^{(BC)}$	100	.0012	.0092	.0039	.0183
$\widehat{\Theta}_n$	500	-.0053	.0094	.1046	.0219
$\widehat{\Theta}_n^{(BC)}$	500	-.0085	.0094	.1086	.0221
$\widehat{\Theta}_n$	1000	-.0071	.0102	.1078	.0216
$\widehat{\Theta}_n^{(BC)}$	1000	-.0115	.0102	.1098	.0217
$\widehat{\Theta}_n$	2000	-.0071	.0106	.1087	.0220
$\widehat{\Theta}_n^{(BC)}$	2000	-.0108	.0106	.1096	.0221
$\widehat{\Theta}_n$	5000	-.0071	.0106	.1087	.0220
$\widehat{\Theta}_n^{(BC)}$	5000	-.0093	.0106	.1090	.0219

Table 2: In this table, we report the sample bias and the standard deviation for the different estimators in the case of a bigger number of oscillations $\delta = (10, 10)$.

h_n	B_n	Chi Sq. Stat	Dg. Fr.	p-value
50	67	719	66	0
100	34	268	33	0
150	23	155	22	0
200	17	116	16	0
250	14	109	13	0
300	12	68.5	11	0
350	10	90.6	9	0
400	9	91.5	8	0
450	8	42.6	7	$6e^{-7}$

Table 3: Summary chi-square statistics χ_n^2 based on the block size h_n. Note that since the number of observations of the last block is arbitrary, the last block estimate $\hat{\eta}_{B_n,n}$ is not used to compute the chi-square statistic.